

Consultation Summary

The Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) sets out site specific options for the general locations identified within the Core Strategy.

The production of this document is an iterative process, and at each stage the local community and other interested parties' views will be fed into the decision-making process to ensure that the final document reflects such views.

As part of this process, the Council published the Allocations DPD Discussion and Consultation document. This set out options for the location of land use allocations, including residential development, employment development, leisure uses, community uses and public open space. The purpose of this document is to provide people with the opportunity to consider and comment upon allocation options that have been suggested for development.

Community involvement on the Allocation DPD Discussion and Consultation Document took place between 17 March and 30 April 2010. In total, 8239 representations were received.

This document provides a concise summary of the issues raised during the consultation. In response to these, initial officer comments are provided to address the issues raised, provide feedback and clarity on specific points and provide initial recommendations for the development of the next version of the Allocations DPD.

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Introduction</p> <p>It was stated that the data contained for the sites in Appendix 1 is incorrect and biased. A respondent commented that the assessment of sites has not been consistent.</p>	<p>The assessment within Appendix 1 utilises a proforma to ensure it is consistent and objective. A small number of changes were made to Appendix 1 following consultation, and the amended Appendix 1 assessment has been published and will be fed into the decision-making process for the next stage of the Development Plan Document.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>There is no evidence as to why the sites in the document have been chosen and why those in Appendix 1 have not. There is no reason given and there is a bias towards large sites.</p>	<p>Sites have been selected according to how well they relate to the aims and locations of the Core Strategy Submission Document. The Allocations DPD must conform to the Core Strategy DPD and so any sites not within locations shown in the Core Strategy have not been taken forward, as explained the Appendix 1 assessment of sites. The Core Strategy considered small sites spread across the District at the Issues and Options stage and the Sustainability Appraisal of this document found that the most sustainable option was several larger sites.</p>
<p>PPG2 has not been considered in terms of proposals for Green Belt release.</p>	<p>This is not the case - the documents produced by the Council do have regard to national planning guidance. PPG2 recognises that if there are exception circumstances then the release of land from the Green Belt may be acceptable. Furthermore in the development of planning policy, the issue of meeting housing needs (PPS3) must be balanced against other considerations such as PPG2.</p>
<p>The sites chosen are unsustainable and Brownfield sites should be used instead. Transport access to the sites is poor and this should be a major consideration. The impact of additional housing on the local areas should be considered.</p>	<p>Brownfield sites have been assessed and considered within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), and the Council's approach to housing (as set out in the Core Strategy which sets the overarching policies for the development of the District) is that brownfield sites be favoured ahead of greenfield wherever possible.</p> <p>Transport is a significant consideration for any of the sites that have been taken forward within the Allocations DPD. The impact of additional development on the area has been considered on a site by site basis, and on a cumulative basis, and Appendix H2 of the Core Strategy outlines the infrastructure requirements that are necessary before development takes place.</p>
<p>Smaller developments should be considered first over larger developments.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy considered small sites spread across the District at the Issues and Options stage and the Sustainability Appraisal of this document found that the most sustainable option a number of larger sites in the general locations set out in the Core Strategy.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Serious concerns over the deliverability of the sites outlined in the SHLAA. The Council is over reliant on the delivery of existing employment sites. Alternative sites are more suitable.</p> <p>Infrastructure improvements need to be implemented prior to any development taking place.</p> <p>Concern that the housing requirement will not be met through the current document, and the assessment of sites in the Allocations DPD and in the SHLAA is not consistent.</p> <p>The location and accessibility of the sites to public transport facilities should be a priority when deciding on the best locations for development.</p> <p>How can the term “creating a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary” be used, when there is already a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary in existence that is being altered to allow for new development?</p> <p>School places should be considered for all locations, not just East Ashingdon and South East Ashingdon.</p>	<p>The SHLAA is a living document and will be updated regularly. The Council consider that all of the sites within the SHLAA are deliverable. The Council will manage the delivery of the sites that come forward through the SHLAA.</p> <p>Appendix H2 of the Core Strategy outlines the infrastructure requirements that will be required prior to the occupation of development coming forward.</p> <p>The Council will adopt the ‘Plan Monitor Manage’ approach which will ensure that a constant five year supply of housing land can be provided in accordance with PPS3.</p> <p>Comment noted. Accessibility of sites to public transport has been considered as part of the decision-making process.</p> <p>The Council has assessed the housing need within the District, and assessed the Brownfield sites that can be used for housing. However, more housing is required than can be accommodated on brownfield sites and as identified within the Core Strategy (the document which sets the overarching approach to development in the District and to which the Allocations Development Plan Document must conform) a small area of Green Belt land is required for residential development. It is important that any changes to the Green Belt boundary result in a new boundary which is defensible.</p> <p>Working with Essex County Council, the requirement for school places has been considered for all locations in the district. The analysis shows that in some parts of the district, additional school places will not be required as a result of the proposed housing development. Where additional school places are required, these will be provided (as set out in the Core Strategy)</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Green Belt land should only be allocated when the supply of Brownfield land has been exhausted.</p> <p>The sites included within the Allocations DPD are ‘options’ and this approach is supported.</p> <p>Industrial sites must be placed away from residential dwellings.</p> <p>The consultation document could have been clearer on the current status of the Core Strategy and the potential for changes to the document through the examination process which will affect site options in the Allocations DPD. Representations have been made on the soundness of the Core Strategy which may lead an independent Government Inspector to conclude an alternative hierarchy and distribution of development.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with additional development.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy prioritises the re-use of brownfield land ahead of Green Belt release wherever this is practicable. However, there is a limited supply of appropriate brownfield land outside of the Green Belt, and some Green Belt reallocation is required.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. This is generally what the Council seek to achieve in reallocating current ‘bad neighbour’ industrial estates identified in the Employment Land Study and the SHLAA to be suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The Core Strategy was at an advanced stage at the time the Allocations Discussion and Consultation Document was published. The Council have now received a report on the soundness of the document from the Planning Inspectorate, and this has confirmed that the Core Strategy is sound and that no changes in respect of the distribution of development are required.</p> <p>Infrastructure providers have been consulted throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy and on this document. The District Council is working closely with them to ensure that the options taken forward are viable, deliverable, and that any negative impacts are mitigated. Appendix H2 of the Core Strategy outlines the infrastructure requirements that are necessary before development takes place.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Comprehensive consultation has not taken place with Essex County Council, other district councils, local parish/town councils, residents associations and other interested parties in and around our District. The additional homes will put an enormous strain on the infrastructure of the area, particularly the road system, which has not been addressed in the document.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in the area, which would change villages into towns.</p> <p>Additional vehicles on the roads from the building of the new homes, the additional residents, their delivery services and visitors and the proposed airport expansion traffic.</p> <p>Additional demand on our doctors and dentists. Additional demand on schools and social services.</p> <p>The number 7 and 8 bus has now been reduced to mainly one bus an hour and there is now no evening number 8 service.</p> <p>Additional demand on gas, electric, telephone, water, sewers and surface/storm water drainage.</p> <p>Moving Eldon Way and the Foundry Estate to a Green Belt site at the airport area will increase mileage for employees and the lack of public transport will limit employment to car users. Cycling would be a poor and unrealistic substitute.</p> <p>ECC has stated that the B1013 is now running at 72% capacity. The Core Strategy proposal would bring the traffic to an unbearable level. No details and estimated costs are given of the many road improvements necessary.</p>	<p>This is not the case. Consultation has taken place with service providers, including Essex County Council, Parish Councils, Residents Associations and residents throughout the development of the Core Strategy and through this document. The purpose of the consultation is to give people an opportunity to share their views and for service providers, with whom we are working closely, to flag up any issues with proposed development sites. Feedback from consultation has played a significant role in producing the Core Strategy (including determining the general locations for new residential development) and will play an important role in the Allocations Development Plan Document. New infrastructure will be required to be implemented alongside new development, as identified in the Core Strategy.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The District is enclosed by the River Crouch, the sea and the Thames and is only properly accessed from the west. For this reason, additional homes should be located in the western part of Rochford District.</p> <p>General abbreviations were used with no definition of their meaning, and clarification was needed as to what was actually being planned as this was not made clear.</p> <p>It is not clear how housing figures have been arrived at, and that previous housing completions have not been taken into account.</p> <p>It is not clear as to the stages of the document and what will happen next and when.</p> <p>There is no available cost benefit analysis, therefore making it more difficult for respondents to assess the true impact of proposals.</p> <p>Comments were made about the nature of the consultation itself, and suggestions made as to how this could be improved to reach more residents.</p>	<p>The general locations for new development are set out in the Core Strategy, including proposals for a proportion of new development to be directed to the western part of the District, but the Council has adopted a balanced strategy for the distribution of new housing across the district.</p> <p>It should be noted that meanings of abbreviations were given for the first time of use, but the comment is noted. The Council also produces a universal glossary of planning terms and abbreviations.</p> <p>This is not the case. Housing figures are determined through the Regional Spatial Strategy (the East of England Plan). The Core Strategy DPD explains the overall housing figures and overarching policies (such as general locations for development). The Allocations DPD looks at specific sites for development.</p> <p>Other Issues and Next Steps on Page 155 outlines the various stages of the document, and the timetable for each one.</p> <p>At this stage of the document the options are at the initial stage, and were presented for discussion. A sustainability appraisal, which provides an analysis of the economic, social and environmental impacts of proposals, will be produced and published prior to the next round of consultation.</p> <p>Comments noted. The Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement that sets out how we will engage with the community and other stakeholders in the plan-making process. However, the Council is always open to suggestions on how better to engage with the community.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Why are sites within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the Urban Capacity Study not assessed or shown within the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The Call for Sites exercise was questioned and it was commented that the responses to this are not available, although they should be included within the document.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all developments within the District and the developments outside the District will have an impact on the movements of residents and employees within the District, and it was questioned why this was not assessed as part of the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>It would have been useful to have links or references to the other planning documents mentioned within the Allocations DPD and that additional cross referencing was required.</p> <p>There is no justification as to why Green Belt release is required, or how previously developed land has been assessed to determine its suitability for residential development.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment is to assess land in the District that may be suitable for housing. This document is an update of the Urban Capacity Study. These documents are evidence base documents which were used when producing the Allocations DPD. The sites within them have already been assessed and thus are not assessed within the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The responses to the Call for Sites exercise are assessed within Appendix 1 of the Allocations DPD and are also available on the Rochford District Council’s website.</p> <p>This is not a matter for the Allocations DPD. The cumulative impact of developments has been considered as part of the Core Strategy, which sets out the general locations for development.</p> <p>Comment noted. The document sought to provide the necessary information without being overly complex and confusing.</p> <p>This is not the case; Justification is provided on Page 4 of the Allocations DPD. In any event, it is for the Core Strategy to set out the planning framework for the district and not the Allocations DPD. The District’s housing supply includes extant permissions and sites already allocated for housing, but additional land needs to be allocated in order to meet the housing need of the District as identified in the Thames Gateway Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This will be allocated through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and release of Green Belt sites. The Council have fully assessed the brownfield sites in the District (through the SHLAA) and the release of this land for housing will not meet the housing need, hence the requirement to allocate some Green Belt.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Empty homes within the District do not appear to have been accounted for.</p> <p>Lack of clarity regarding the Council’s position in the situation that housing need is such in the future that no additional dwellings are needed. It was raised that this needs to be stated within the document.</p> <p>How is the allocation of dwellings determined in terms of location - the allocation did not seem to reflect the infrastructure and services available in each of the locations specified.</p>	<p>The requirements of the East of England Plan are expressed in net additional dwellings, and do not include empty homes. Strategic Housing Market Assessments (which evidence the need for additional homes) consider the number of vacant dwellings in their calculations. The 2010 Thames Gateway South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment noted there were 957 vacant dwellings in Rochford District in 2009, and accounted for these in its calculations.</p> <p>The housing need and delivery will be monitored on a regular basis, through documents such as the SHLAA and the Annual Monitoring Report. The LDF documents are known as “living documents” and therefore can be amended (which would be subject to public consultation) and updated as required. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment demonstrates that housing is required, and is projected to continue to be required in the future. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment shows that additional land is required for housing.</p> <p>The locations of the land to be reallocated for residential and employment development were decided through the preparation of the Core Strategy DPD. This document has been subject to several rounds of consultation, and through the Sustainability Appraisal (an assessment of economic, social and environmental impacts) of each of the stages of the Core Strategy, locations that the Council considered to be most sustainable were selected. The Allocations DPD must conform to the Core Strategy and as such the site options within it reflect the general locations determined to be the most sustainable within the Core Strategy.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>With regard to industrial locations that have been identified as having the potential to be used for alternative uses within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, what types of alternative use have been identified and what is the justification.</p> <p>What improvements to the highways network will be required at each of the locations specified within the document? The impact on the A127 from the development proposed was also questioned, and the contingency plan for the A127 was requested.</p> <p>Are the Flood Zone designations within the document current and accurate as the Environment Agency update these every quarter?</p> <p>Rochford District has an ageing population - this will result in additional homes becoming available through movement into sheltered housing and care homes, and death. Are these changes accounted for within the document?</p>	<p>The Employment Land Study and the SHLAA assessed existing employment sites for their current use and whether they were 'fit for purpose'. The Employment Land Study stated that several sites were not appropriate for industrial purposes due to their location, accessibility, proximity to residential areas, and building quality on the site and consequently the site would be more suited for alternative purposes. Justification for this can be found within the Employment Land Study and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p> <p>The exact highway improvements will be determined at a later stage of document production process, when the exact sites have been assessed and selected. The consideration of potential sites will include views from the Highways Authority. Once the sites have been selected, the highways authority will be consulted to ascertain the exact highways requirements. This will be done on an individual location basis and on a cumulative basis which will assess the impact of the cumulative development on major routes such as the A127.</p> <p>The Flood Zone designations were correct at the time of publication. They will be updated for future iterations of the document if required.</p> <p>This is accounted for within the Core Strategy DPD which states that new development should contain a mix of dwelling types to ensure they cater for all people within the community whatever their housing needs. The requirements for different house tenures is informed by the Thames Gateway South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Elderly residents of the District perceive additional development to result in increased crime levels, increased noise, an increase in cold calling, worsening pavement conditions and an increase in children playing around the village centre, increasing noise levels further. How does the Council intend to help the older population come to terms with the proposed changes?</p> <p>The level of funding being received currently by Parish Councils from Rochford District Council is insufficient for youth facilities, pensioners' facilities, maintenance of public areas and toilets, footpaths, street lighting, bridle and cycle path maintenance, recycling rubbish and dog waste bins. How the District Council intend to increase funding to Parish Councils in order to accommodate the additional residents and associated new facilities?</p> <p>There are a large number of mobile homes within Hullbridge and these are an important feature of the area. Why are Gypsy and Travellers needs given attention within the document and not the needs of mobile home residents?</p>	<p>The Sustainable Community Strategy for Rochford District was produced by the Local Strategic Partnership (a partnership of key public, private and voluntary sector organisations) and gives all organisations a clear focus on what the priorities are in the District. These priorities include supporting the District's ageing population and fostering greater community cohesion. In respect of the latter, the Sustainable Community Strategy notes there are currently 'sticking points' between the differing generations within our communities. There is a perception of anti-social behaviour and a fear of crime and disorder, a perception that the Local Strategic Partnership will help to address through greater community engagement and supporting community projects.</p> <p>This is not a question for the Allocations DPD. In any event, Parish Councils make their own decisions about funding requirements through their annual precept, which is an addition to the standard council tax bill. There is also some misunderstanding in the items listed of the responsibilities of the district council versus those of parish councils.</p> <p>It is also relevant to note that developers will be required to make payments that contribute towards the infrastructure for which their developments engender a need.</p> <p>The needs of all the district's residents are considered through the preparation of planning policy documents. There is no evidence to suggest that additional land is required to be allocated to meet the needs of mobile home residents.</p> <p>Gypsies and Travellers are recognised ethnic groups under the Race Relations Act (1976 and 2000), and there is an identified need for a small number of additional pitches to be allocated, as evidenced by the 2009 Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA).</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Residential Land Allocations</p> <p>Who are the additional dwellings aimed at in terms of age groups and religious groups, what kind of dwellings will be delivered, and which development guidelines will have to be adhered to?</p> <p>How can the Council know that the required number of homes can be delivered in each site specified within the document, and how can additional homes be prevented?</p> <p>How is the term ‘the site has good access’ quantified and determined?</p> <p>How can the impact of any development at any of the locations be assessed when there has been no assessment of the impact on local facilities, including local post offices, community facilities, leisure centres, electricity supplies, water supplies, recycling bin availability, among others identified?</p>	<p>The dwellings are aimed at those in need of housing which can apply to persons of any age group, religious group etc. The types of dwellings that will be delivered will have to comply to policies set out within the Core Strategy and the Development Management DPD which state that new developments must be a mix of dwelling types, and that developers should consult with the Council’s Housing Strategy team to determine the required mix of dwellings types in order to ensure the housing need is being met.</p> <p>The Allocations document, once submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, will be tested on a number of things, and one of the requirements is that the document, and subsequently the selected sites, be deliverable. There is ongoing communication between the Council, service providers and potential developers in order to ensure that the sites are deliverable. The Council will only allocate land to accommodate the housing that is required – additional Green Belt land will not be reallocated as residential.</p> <p>The level of accessibility is dependant upon a range of factors including access to services and facilities, and the highway network. The term “good access” has been used where appropriate to highlight good locations for development., though many other issues are also taken into account.</p> <p>The Council has assessed the impact of new development on local services and set out in the Core Strategy a range of measures which will be required within each general location for development. Furthermore the Council continues to liaise with service providers to ensure that water, waste and other facilities have the capacity to meet development needs.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>How can a Green Belt boundary be termed “defensible” as it has been made evident that the boundary can be amended when required?</p> <p>The natural streams and brooks that exist within the District have not been accounted for within the document, and as these remove a large amount of the surface water within the District, and flood regularly as a result, the impact on them must be assessed thoroughly.</p> <p>Residents have paid a premium to live with views of the Green Belt and development of sites overlooked by dwellings will have a negative impact on the quality of life of residents. It was asked whether the council will compensate residents for this loss of view, and what the Council plan to do to ensure that the mental health of residents is not affected in any way.</p> <p>Why are details of the proposed housing was not shown? (e.g. types of housing, dwelling footprints etc).</p>	<p>The term ‘defensible’ does not mean that a boundary will not be changed. Rather it means that where a plan has been properly prepared with long-term Green Belt boundaries, those boundaries should be defensible. The Council needs to provide a balance between providing homes to meet the housing need, and protecting the environmental characteristics of the District.</p> <p>This is not correct. Developments are required to take flooding issues into account and where necessary Strategic Flood Risk Assessments will be carried out, and to mitigate against the impact of new development on the environment, including natural streams and brooks and surface water, it is a requirement that new developments provide Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS).</p> <p>There is no legal right to an uninterrupted view of the countryside and the allocation of land within the Development Plan does not affect this. The development of new residential dwellings will require planning permission and, in considering applications, the Council will have regard to the impact of any proposals on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring homes, i.e. issues such as overlooking will be addressed through the planning application process.</p> <p>The purpose of the Allocations DPD is to allocate land use within the District. Design principles and standards, layout of housing, use of materials and so will be dealt with through the preparation of design briefs informed by the policies set out in the Development Management DPD, and through consultation with specialists through the planning application process.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>A definition is required of the highway network, and of the term ‘excellent accessibility’.</p> <p>The Council has not assessed the cumulative impact of the developments across the District on the highway network.</p> <p>Support is given to the identification of South Hawkwell as a location for new housing as this accords with the emerging Core Strategy and is a sustainable location for growth. The table in the introduction should make clear that housing numbers are a minimum.</p> <p>The impact additional dwellings would have on infrastructure and services within the District, including health services, schools, amenities and highways.</p>	<p>The highway network can be defined as a total system of highways, roads, streets, bridges, tunnels, and related facilities. The level of accessibility is dependant upon a range of factors including access to services and facilities and the highway network.</p> <p>Essex County Council as the highways authority have been closely consulted throughout the process of the Core Strategy DPD and the Allocations DPD and as such have considered the cumulative, and individual, impact of the developments across the District on the highway network. The exact highway improvements will be determined at a later stage of document production process, when the exact sites have been assessed and selected. The consideration of potential sites will include views from the Highways Authority. Once the sites have been selected, the highways authority will be consulted to ascertain the exact highways requirements. This will be done on an individual location basis and on a cumulative basis which will assess the impact of the cumulative development</p> <p>Comment noted. Overall housing numbers are a minimum, as set by the East of England Plan. However, in respect of the allocation of land, it is however important that Green Belt land is only allocated for residential where required.</p> <p>Comments noted. Any impact will be mitigated against and the Council are working with service providers to ensure all the sites are deliverable, and that additional infrastructure is provided to serve the additional development.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The assumptions made in relation to the deliverability/developability of the sources of housing land supply are over-ambitious, and fail to show how contingencies will be handled over the Plan period. Furthermore, the nine general locations identified for extensions to residential envelopes fail to promote new housing development in the most sustainable locations. There should be a higher quantum of development in the Tier 1 settlements in the first instance, and further land should be identified in the Allocations DPD to meet the proposed short-fall, and create a more sustainable pattern of development, than that proposed.</p> <p>A respondent questioned why the smaller villages of Paglesham, Fambridge, Stambridge, etc. are not mentioned – it was suggested there is potential for some small development in these areas in order to build a more viable community.</p> <p>The Core Strategy recognises that 2745 dwellings will have to be provided on land which is currently allocated as Green Belt by 2025, but the totals in the table on Page 4 equate to 2785; which figure is correct? It was suggested that the dwellings allocation needs to be recalculated to confirm correct figures together with reviewing the 9 general locations.</p> <p>'Phasing' should be removed from the Core Strategy and the sites should be allowed to come forward as they become available in order to ensure a greater certainty of achieving a continuous supply of land for housing delivery.</p>	<p>These comments are not accepted. Sustainability Appraisals have been carried out on all stages of the Core Strategy. At the Core Strategy Issues and Options stage several options were considered including higher quantum of developments in Tier 1 settlements, a new developments encompassing all required dwellings, and spreading the housing equally throughout the District. It was found through the Sustainability Appraisal that these options were not considered to be as sustainable as the approach that has now been taken. As identified within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, there are available sites within the general locations identified capable of meeting at least the number of dwellings stipulated.</p> <p>These villages have been defined in the Core Strategy as Tier 4 settlements where development is considered to be unsustainable. The general locations identified in the Core Strategy are supported by a Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The figure of 2745 refers to the number of dwellings required to be provided once deliverable, non-Green Belt sites have been accounted for. This figure is a minimum, and in addition the plan is required to have a degree of flexibility, hence the total of 2785 dwellings in the table on Page 4 of the consultation document.</p> <p>Phasing has been included to ensure that brownfield sites come forward, wherever possible, before Green Belt sites. There has been an assessment in the Annual Monitoring Report which shows that the Council will have a continuous supply of housing.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Housing could be an option to replace the Eon site.</p> <p>The allocation sites feeding onto Rawreth Lane will significantly damage the Green Belt status of this land and overload the existing inadequate infrastructure.</p> <p>The consultation on the Allocations DPD 'Discussion and Consultation' Document is both premature and inappropriate prior to the receipt of the Inspector's Report on the Rochford Core Strategy.</p> <p>No further work should be undertaken on the Allocations DPD until the Core Strategy is adopted. The proposed provisions of the Allocations DPD can then be reassessed to ensure that it accords with the finalised Core Strategy in terms of the level of greenfield land release and the size and distribution of strategic sites.</p> <p>Concern about the proposed loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>There are more suitable locations for housing to be developed within the District.</p>	<p>Yes, this is agreed. The former Eon site on London Road, Rayleigh is within an existing residential area. As such, the existing allocation of land (as set by the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006)) would not oppose residential redevelopment of the site. If the site were to be developed for housing, it would constitute a windfall site.</p> <p>The amount of Green Belt land allocated for housing will be limited to that required to meet the District's housing requirement. The vast majority of the Green Belt will remain allocated as such.</p> <p>Rochford District Council is working closely with Essex County Council as the highway authority to ensure that any negative impacts on the highway network are mitigated against.</p> <p>The Allocations Document is a separate document to the Core Strategy, and as such will undergo a separate consultation process. One of the stipulations is however that the Allocations DPD be in conformity with the Core Strategy. The Rochford District Core Strategy has now been adopted, with strategic policies for housing development as per the version of the Core Strategy submitted for examination. The Allocations DPD will conform to the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council is aware of these concerns, and will only release Green Belt where absolutely necessary. The total amount of Green Belt proposed for release is less than 1% of the Green Belt within the District.</p> <p>As part of the Core Strategy, several Sustainability Appraisals have been carried out to help ascertain where the most suitable and sustainable locations are and it is the Council's opinion, justified by the Sustainability Appraisals, that the most suitable locations are those which have been selected.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>SHLAA</p> <p>Currently infrastructure is inadequate and further development would exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>How are infrastructure improvements to be funded; what improvements will be required and delivered?</p> <p>Brownfield sites are previously developed land and as such their redevelopment will have no adverse impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Essex County Fire and Rescue Service commented that they have determined that none of the proposed sites pose a problem to the Fire and Rescue Service and as such they have no comment on the Allocations Development Plan Document.</p>	<p>Rochford District Council is working closely with Essex County Council as the highway authority to ensure that any negative impacts on the highway network are mitigated against. Infrastructure providers have been consulted throughout the development of the Core Strategy and on this document. The District Council is working closely with them to ensure that the options taken forward are viable, deliverable, and that any negative impacts are mitigated. Appendix H2 of the Core Strategy outlines the infrastructure requirements that are necessary before development takes place.</p> <p>Detailed proposals, including funding, will be assessed and published at a later stage of the Allocations DPD and through the Planning Application process.</p> <p>Yes, agreed in principle. However, it should be noted that Green Belt is a planning designation and not a description of land. As such land may be brownfield/previously developed and in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>North of London Road – NLR1</p> <p>Studies must be carried out to determine the impacts on the Rayleigh area. This should include but not be limited to schools, roads (RDC & ECC responsibility), doctors, dentist, increase parking in Rayleigh town centre, station access and parking. The total plan must then be costed and incorporated into the development plans, this document should be submitted for public consultation. This will stop fragmented development.</p> <p>This area may be a flood zone and flooding in the area would worsen.</p>	<p>Infrastructure and service providers have been engaged in the process so that the impact on infrastructure and services is accounted for. A range of costs for infrastructure provision has been presented at the Core Strategy stage.</p> <p>The Council will prepare a document that sets out charges for developers to contribute to the delivery of new infrastructure.</p> <p>At this stage of the document the options are at the initial stage, and were presented for discussion. A sustainability appraisal, which provides an analysis of the economic, social and environmental impacts of proposals, will be produced and published prior to the next round of consultation.</p> <p>The Council recognises that flooding is a significant issue within the District, and as such, has sought to direct development away from the areas most vulnerable. The sites which have been considered within the document are considered to be the most sustainable given the alternatives. Any areas that are within flood Zone 2 or 3 (as defined by the Environment Agency) will undergo a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and must mitigate against any flooding issues before any development can be permitted. Areas within the flood zone will be used for non-vulnerable uses, and the development must also provide Sustainable Drainage Systems to alleviate flooding issues. Surface water flooding has been considered within the Core Strategy DPD and all residential development over 10 units will be required to incorporate runoff control via sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) to ensure runoff and infiltration rates do not increase the likelihood of flooding</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The Council should produce a separate document detailing infrastructure requirements and how these will be funded.</p> <p>No defensible Green Belt boundary to the south of the site, and not clear how a link could be provided between Rawreth Lane and London Road.</p> <p>Other locations that are not within flood zone should be considered as an alternative.</p>	<p>As set out in the Core Strategy, all residential development over 10 units will be required to incorporate runoff control via sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) to ensure runoff and infiltration rates do not increase the likelihood of flooding.</p> <p>The strategic issues in relation to the provision of transport infrastructure are addressed in the Core Strategy. The Council intend to produce a Transportation SPD which will deal with these issues in detail. The Council has worked closely with service providers to ensure that the developments are deliverable and will not have any negative impact on infrastructure and service provision. The Council also intends to prepare a document setting out charges for developers to contribute to the delivery of new infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the concerns are noted, the Council does not intend to allow any site to be developed without careful consideration being given to the need for defensible boundaries. The document identified a range of potential site options for each general location identified in the Core Strategy DPD. Those sites which are less likely to be able to provide a defensible Green Belt boundary were identified in the document. Further detail will be provided within the next version of the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>There is no intention of allowing any built development on any land within a flood zone in this location. The Council recognises that flooding is a significant issue within the District, and as such, has sought to direct development away from the areas most vulnerable. Some land in this area is within the flood zone but will only be used, if required for non-vulnerable uses, open space, for example. New built development must include Sustainable Drainage Systems to alleviate flooding issues. Surface water flooding has been considered within the Core Strategy DPD.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Chelmsford Borough Council commented that residents in Battlesbridge could benefit from the new community services and facilities as part of the development although they note there is a number of existing site constraints.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Concern regarding the loss of Green Belt and countryside.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council will seek to release the minimum amount of Green Belt necessary to meet the future housing needs of the District. See comments above.</p>
<p>NLR1 appeared to be the most suitable place to support 550 new dwellings; reasons cited including that it is next to existing residential development, near transport links, and not on the already busy London Road. Support the creation of 550 new dwellings if the houses built were affordable for first time buyers and not built on top of each other with no open space.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>The sewerage system, and other amenity services are at capacity currently, and the systems would not be able to cope with additional housing.</p>	<p>This is not understood to be the case – the requisite upgrades to such infrastructure will be made where required. The Council are working with service providers to ensure that the developments are deliverable.</p>
<p>Option NLR1 would not allow for a link road between Rawreth Lane and London Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Schools may not have the capacity to support pupils arising from additional housing.</p>	<p>The Council has worked closely with Essex County Council Schools Children and Families service to ensure that schools have the capacity to support increased population, and if not identify appropriate sites to locate new educational facilities, as well as introducing requirements for developers to be required to make financial contributions to the provision of educational facilities where appropriate.</p>
<p>Concern that development in this location would lead to coalescence of Rayleigh and Wickford.</p>	<p>It is considered by the Council that this would not result in coalescence with Wickford as the arrangement of the site would enable the provision of a “green buffer” to the west to prevent this, as identified in Appendix H1 of the Core Strategy DPD.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Anglian Water Ltd stated that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades will be required in order to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>Option NLR1 would have less impact on landscape than other options.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>North of London Road – NLR2</p> <p>General on concerns with building on flood zone, and the impact additional dwellings would have on infrastructure, particularly highways and schools, as per comments regarding NLR1.</p> <p>Concern regarding the loss of Green Belt with this option.</p>	<p>Flooding is one of the main constraints within the District and as such the Council is working with the Environment Agency to ensure that flooding issues are not worsened in any way.</p> <p>The Council is working closely with infrastructure and service providers to ensure any impact on infrastructure and services is mitigated against.</p> <p>The Council have determined that there is a need to release Green Belt land to support development due to the physical constraints within the District and the limited amount of suitable brownfield land. Green Belt land, however, will only be released for development after previously developed sites have been developed. The Council will minimise the release of Green Belt and mitigate against any negative impacts the release may have.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Concern was shown that part of this area is seen to be in Flood Zone.</p> <p>Development of this site would lead to the coalescence of Rayleigh and Rawreth.</p> <p>Flexibility needs to be shown with regard to the options in the document and the time periods proposed.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd commented that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades will be required to serve the proposed growth in this location.</p> <p>North of London Road – NLR3</p> <p>General comments were as per NLR1 and NLR2 regarding loss of Green Belt and agricultural land, impact on schools and infrastructure, particularly highways, and the impact developing this location would have on flooding as part of the site lies within Flood Zone.</p>	<p>The Council recognises that flooding is a significant issue within the District, and as such, has sought to direct development away from the areas most vulnerable. The sites which have been considered within the document are considered to be the most sustainable given the alternatives. Any areas that are within flood Zone 2 or 3 (as defined by the Environment Agency) will undergo a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and must mitigate against any flooding issues before any development can be permitted. Areas within the flood zone will be used for non-vulnerable uses, and the development must also provide Sustainable Drainage Systems to alleviate flooding issues. Surface water flooding has been considered within the Core Strategy DPD and all residential development over 10 units will be required to incorporate runoff control via sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) to ensure runoff and infiltration rates do not increase the likelihood of flooding.</p> <p>The site will include a “green buffer” to reduce the risk of coalescence with Rayleigh and Rawreth, as identified in Appendix H1 of the Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>Comment noted. This will be done through the ‘Plan Monitor Manage’ approach.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Concern that once development starts taking place on Green Belt land, a precedent will be set and there will be further and further development resulting in erosion of the District's Green Belt.</p> <p>More suitable Brownfield sites had been put forward and these should be considered prior to release of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Sports facilities will be lost if this option were to be taken forward.</p> <p>This site is the worst of all, as it will greet visitors to Rayleigh with a mass of concrete, and obscure the scenic northerly views. It will allow for future development to the north and not create a strong Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Sport England strongly objected as this would include Rayleigh Sports & Social Club's site which is where Rayleigh Town Football Club and Rayleigh Fairview Cricket Club are based. These are two of the principal community sports clubs in the Rayleigh area. Potential redevelopment of the site would result in the loss of the entire playing field (which is large enough to accommodate the equivalent of at least three football pitches and a cricket pitch). No reference is made to the loss of these facilities in the document or to replacement provision being an essential pre-requisite of any development.</p> <p>Traffic data should be provided for the surrounding routes and an impact assessment carried out to assess the impact of additional housing in the area.</p>	<p>The Council is planning for the long term needs of the District in terms of housing requirements and Green Belt release. The Council will ensure that the minimum amount of Green Belt necessary will be reallocated to meet these needs.</p> <p>Brownfield sites have been considered within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the Urban Capacity Study.</p> <p>There is no intention for any sports facilities to be lost. The land would be allocated as residential, and as part of the development community and youth facilities need to be provided. This could entail the use of the existing facilities or the development of new, modern replacement facilities.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is not intended that there will be any loss of sports facilities within this option. The existing facilities can either be accommodated within the development or new, modern replacement facilities be provided.</p> <p>Essex County Council, as the Highway Authority, has been consulted throughout the production of this document. Assessments will be carried out at a later stage once further details of sites have been determined, and such an assessment is then possible.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>It was stated by Anglian Water that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>Traffic counts along London Road should be carried out, and any traffic data that has already been collated for London Road be published.</p> <p>The Environment Agency comment that this site is least affected by Flood Zone.</p> <p>North of London Road – NLR4</p> <p>General comments were as per NLR1, NLR2 and NLR3 regarding loss of Green Belt and agricultural land, impact on schools and infrastructure, particularly highways, and the impact developing this location would have on flooding as part of the site lies within Flood Zone</p> <p>Once development starts taking place on Green Belt land, a precedent will be set and there will be further and further development resulting in erosion of the District’s Green Belt</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Essex County Council, as the Highway Authority, has been consulted throughout the production of this document. Traffic data and impact assessments will be detailed at a later stage of the document, and consulted on.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Please see comments above.</p> <p>This is not correct. Allocating land for development in a development plan does not set a precedent for further land to be released in an unplanned way. Council is planning for the long term needs of the District in terms of housing requirements and Green Belt release. Through the ‘Plan Monitor Manage’ the Council will ensure that the minimum amount of Green Belt necessary will be reallocated to meet these needs. By reallocating land now, and ensuring an adequate housing land supply as required by government, the vast majority of the Green Belt will remain protected from inappropriate development and a long term defensible boundary will be put in place.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Options NLR4 and NLR5 would appear to be the least unfavourable, although still highly unwelcome. This option minimises the loss of agricultural land and to some extent preserves the semi-rural character of this part of Rayleigh. A reduced version of these options combined with redevelopment of the industrial estate could be a reasonable compromise if there is no alternative to development in this area.</p> <p>The Environment Agency stated that with this option, the flood zone could act to split the development, however it could also represent an opportunity to integrate the main watercourse (Rawreth Brook) into the development through the inclusion of public open space etc.</p> <p>In considering the site specific allocation, the document needs to give greater consideration to (a) the need for flexibility (b) the need for a land allocation of sufficient size to deliver the minimum requirements, and (c) the proper consideration of a long-term and permanent Green Belt boundary which will not be subject to pressure for amendment in the post-plan period. None of the five options are of sufficient size to deliver the Core Strategy requirement. A combination of these options, together potentially with adjoining land, would provide a developable and deliverable site area capable of implementing the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Part of the site lies within Flood Zone.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>In the Council’s view, the options are large enough to accommodate the number of dwellings specified in the Core Strategy and the requisite infrastructure. It is important to ensure that as much Green Belt as possible is protected, but the view that a larger area should be reallocated to alleviate any possible pressure on the boundary is noted.</p> <p>The Council recognises that flooding is a significant issue within the District, and as such, has sought to direct development away from the areas most vulnerable. The sites which have been considered within the document are considered to be the most sustainable given the alternatives. Any areas that are within flood Zone 2 or 3 (as defined by the Environment Agency) will undergo a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and must mitigate against any flooding issues before any development can be permitted. Areas within the flood zone will be used for non-vulnerable uses, and the development must also provide Sustainable Drainage Systems to alleviate flooding issues.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Anglian Water Services Ltd comment that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades will be required in order to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>North of London Road – Option NLR5</p> <p>Sport England strongly objects as this would include Rayleigh Sports & Social Club's site which is where Rayleigh Town Football Club and Rayleigh Fairview Cricket Club are based. These are two of the principal community sports clubs in the Rayleigh area. Potential redevelopment of the site would result in the loss of the entire playing field (which is large enough to accommodate the equivalent of at least three football pitches and a cricket pitch). No reference is made to the loss of these facilities in the document or to replacement provision being an essential pre-requisite of any development. Other respondents echoed these concerns.</p> <p>Concerns as per NLR1, NLR2, NLR3, and NLR4 in terms of loss of Green Belt, impact on infrastructure, impact on the highway network, and the proximity of the site to Flood Zone.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is not intended that there will be any loss of sports facilities within this option. The existing facilities can either be accommodated within the development or new, modern replacement facilities be provided.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Studies should be carried out to assess the impact this potential development will have on the Rayleigh area. This should include but not be limited to Schools, Roads (RDC & ECC responsibility), Doctors, Dentist, Increase Parking in Rayleigh Town Centre, Station access and parking. The total plan must then be costed and incorporated in the development plans, this document should be submitted for public consultation. Hopefully this will stop fragmented development.</p>	<p>Infrastructure and service providers have been engaged in the process so that the impact on infrastructure and services is accounted for. A range of costs for infrastructure provision has been presented at the Core Strategy stage.</p> <p>At this stage of the document the options are at the initial stage, and were presented for discussion. A sustainability appraisal, which provides an analysis of the economic, social and environmental impacts of proposals, will be produced and published prior to the next round of consultation.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>There are more suitable sites for development located elsewhere in the District, and that Rawreth had been allocated more than other areas in the District.</p> <p>NLR5 is probably the best option because it has a strong defensible boundary and a bus service could be provided between London Rd and Rawreth Lane.</p> <p>Transport opportunities are better with this location as there would be access available to provide a north-south bus route through the site. There was also an opportunity to provide a defensible Green Belt boundary to the west of the site. It was commented that this site would have better integration with the existing settlement than other options put forward in the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Public transport to this location is currently insufficient.</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Ltd stated that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades would be required to serve proposed growth at this location.</p> <p>This site would be more suitable than other options due to the ability to provide a north-south bus link, and the natural extension to the existing settlement.</p> <p>North of London Road – Are these the right options?</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has gone through several iterations, examining a number of options for the distribution of development, and each of these has had a Sustainability Appraisal carried out on it. As such, the Core Strategy identifies what are considered to be the most appropriate areas for development. The Allocations DPD looks at specific sites within these locations.</p> <p>Agreed, that it is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. One of the requirements from this site is that public transport infrastructure improvements are provided.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The Rawreth Lane area is already overdeveloped. Only sites with existing industrial useage should be considered for residential development.</p> <p>Until the total development plans and impacts on total infrastructure have been considered, costed and incorporated in the development plans, it is impossible to say which are the right options. General objection to fragmented development.</p> <p>Alternative options were suggested for consideration.</p> <p>Industrial areas should be used first for residential development and Green Belt should not be released.</p> <p>Other options have not been properly considered and only larger sites have been properly assessed. No justification has been given as to why the preferred options have been chosen and why other sites were not taken forward.</p>	<p>Brownfield sites have been assessed in the Employment Land Study and the SHLAA for their suitability and sustainability for residential development. The Core Strategy DPD and the evidence base which supports it justifies why a small amount of Green Belt is required to be reallocated during the plan period.</p> <p>Infrastructure and service providers have been engaged in the process so that the impact on infrastructure and services is accounted for. A range of costs for infrastructure provision has been presented at the Core Strategy stage.</p> <p>At this stage of the document the options are at the initial stage, and were presented for discussion. A sustainability appraisal, which provides an analysis of the economic, social and environmental impacts of proposals, will be produced and published prior to the next round of consultation.</p> <p>The Development Plan seeks to avoid fragmenting development by ensuring that development is comprehensively planned, which also helps ensure the necessary infrastructure and service accompany new housing.</p> <p>These will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Comment noted. This comment reflects the Council's approach for the future development of the District.</p> <p>The Core Strategy DPD considered small sites spread across the District at the Issues and Options stage and the Sustainability Appraisal of this document found that the most sustainable option was several larger sites. The Allocations DPD must conform to the Core Strategy DPD.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>None of the options provide the opportunity to create a defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Should other sites in this location be considered?</p> <p>Several other locations were put forward including several smaller sites, sites with existing industrial usage, additional locations were suggested other than North of London Road.</p> <p>The quantity of housing suggested in this location is far too high and should be spread more evenly across the District.</p> <p>West Rochford</p> <p>This is not a suitable location for the number of dwellings suggested.</p>	<p>The provision of a “green buffer” or ”green stopper” to the west of these options would ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained.</p> <p>The Allocations DPD must conform to the general locations identified within the Core Strategy DPD. Additional sites will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The Council has developed a balanced approach to the provision of housing across the District within the Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>Whilst the comment is noted, no information has been provided to indicate why this is the case. The Core Strategy has gone through several iterations, examining a series of options for the distribution and numbers of development, and each of these has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal. As such, the Core Strategy identifies what are considered to be the most appropriate areas for development. The Allocations DPD looks at specific sites within these locations. The Allocations DPD must conform to the general locations and numbers of dwellings identified within the Core Strategy DPD.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Development in this location would have a major impact on the infrastructure, not just in the vicinity of it but to the whole of Rochford/Hockley. Before any approval is given, studies must be carried out to determine the impacts on the Rochford/Hockley area. This should include but not be limited to schools, roads (RDC & ECC responsibility), doctors, dentists, increase parking in Rochford Town Centre, station access and parking. The total plan must then be costed and incorporated in the development plans, this document should be submitted for public consultation.</p> <p>Development at West Rochford would have less impact on the town centre than other locations in Rochford.</p> <p>Development may lead to a separate “town centre” being created.</p> <p>Impact that development at this location would have on Ironwell Lane.</p>	<p>There is no disagreement that housing development will have implications for infrastructure and services and that developers should pay the costs. However, infrastructure and service providers have been engaged in the plan making process so that the impact on infrastructure and services is fully accounted for. A range of costs for infrastructure provision has been presented at the Core Strategy stage (Core Strategy Topic Paper 2), and the Council has also committed to preparing a document setting out charges to be paid by developers towards the delivery of required infrastructure.</p> <p>At this stage of the document the options are at the initial stage, and were presented for discussion. A sustainability appraisal, which provides an analysis of the economic, social and environmental impacts of proposals, will be produced and published prior to the next round of consultation.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>It is not intended to provide shops or other facilities within the development area, though a new primary school is proposed.</p> <p>This is an important consideration that will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD and through the assessment of any planning application for development.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>To locate 600 dwellings in this location will have a major impact on the infrastructure, not just in the vicinity of it but to the whole of Rochford/Hockley. Before any approval is given, studies must be carried out to determine the impacts on the Rochford/Hockley Area. This should include but not be limited to Schools, Roads (RDC & ECC responsibility), Doctors, Dentist, Increase Parking in Rochford Town Centre, Station access and parking. The total plan must then be costed and incorporated in the development plans, this document should be submitted for public consultation. Hopefully this will stop fragmented development.</p> <p>Development at this location would result in unnecessary loss of Green Belt, loss of prime agricultural land, disruption at the railway bridge junction at Hall Road as a result of additional traffic, and have a negative impact on the Conservation Area of Rochford.</p>	<p>There is no disagreement that housing development will have implications for infrastructure and services and that developers should pay the costs. However, infrastructure and service providers have been engaged in the plan making process so that the impact on infrastructure and services is fully accounted for. A range of costs for infrastructure provision has been presented at the Core Strategy stage (Core Strategy Topic Paper 2), and the Council has also committed to preparing a document setting out charges to be paid by developers towards the delivery of required infrastructure.</p> <p>At this stage of the document the options are at the initial stage, and were presented for discussion. A sustainability appraisal, which provides an analysis of the economic, social and environmental impacts of proposals, will be produced and published prior to the next round of consultation.</p> <p>As identified within the Core Strategy, some Green Belt land is required to be allocated for development in order for the District’s housing requirement to be met.</p> <p>The majority of land surrounding Rochford is Grade 1 Agricultural Land. Land to the west is a mixture of Grade 1 and Grade 2; land to the east is predominantly Grade 1 with the exception of the area of non-agricultural land occupied by an industrial estate. Agricultural land classification is only one consideration in determining the most sustainable locations for development.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>This location would be suitable for additional development due its location and accessibility to the highways network.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of development at the locations proposed in the Allocations DPD.</p>	<p>The Rochford Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan states that 'Until the first half of the 20th century, Hall Road was undeveloped. It still has a rural feel to it, to which the trees along it make a significant contribution, and forms an attractive approach to the town and conservation area.' It recommends that further suburbanisation of the road should be avoided in order to preserve the existing approach to the town and the setting of Rochford Hall, which is a grade I Listed Building to the south east of the site ('Rochford Hall and ruins'). There are other Listed Buildings in proximity to the site, including a grade II* Listed Building ('Church of St. Andrew') and a grade II listed milestone ('Milestone on northern verge opposite house called Birches, Hall Road'), as well as other listed items. It is relevant to note that there is residential development to the south of Hall Road and close to the Conservation Area. There is also already residential development to the north of Hall Road. The frontage of Hall Road in this location will need to be carefully considered with any development, for example through the retention of existing hedgerows and the siting of the proposed public open space. Development would not intrinsically have a negative impact on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Council has worked closely with infrastructure and service providers to ensure that issues such as the impact on the highway network can be addressed for a site coming forward within this location. Feedback from infrastructure and service providers will be used to help determine the most suitable sites, and the planning obligations that developers will be required to meet.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This was considered at the Core Strategy stage when the general locations were identified.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The rural nature of the area would be lost if development at this location takes place.</p> <p>Archaeological surveys would need to be undertaken prior to any development taking place.</p> <p>West Rochford – WR1</p> <p>Existing highway and infrastructure is already over capacity in Rayleigh, Rochford and nearby Southend. Any development must provide mitigation against its impact.</p> <p>The location of the development would not facilitate cohesion with the existing settlement and instead two distinct communities would be created.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of the London Southend Airport Joint Area Action Plan development and development at this location.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council are committed to ensuring Green Belt is only reallocated for development when required, and to ensure the vast majority of the Green Belt remain as such. The final Allocations Development Plan Document will set out requirements for developments for sites identified which will address issues such as the impact on the character of the area.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The principle of 600 additional dwellings being directed to West Rochford has already been determined through the Core Strategy, and Essex County Council Highways are satisfied with this approach. The Council recognise that improvements to highways are required. The precise nature of improvements required will be dependent on the final site identified, and the Council will continue to work with Essex County Council Highways to ensure the final site allocated is the most suitable, and to identify the detailed highway improvements required.</p> <p>The site option WR1 is immediately adjacent to the existing, established community. Development at this location would have the potential to integrate with the existing community. It would be important to ensure that any development of this site is designed in such a way as to provide links between the new development and existing built environment to the east, to ensure the new development is not segregated from the existing community.</p> <p>The cumulative impacts of employment and housing developments was considered through the Core Strategy.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Anglian Water Services Ltd that there is currently capacity available to serve proposed growth at this location.</p> <p>It is better to develop outside the current town boundary, thereby resulting in less congestion in town.</p> <p>The Environment Agency note that there is a small area of Flood Zone 2 associated with the north eastern corner of the proposed site.</p> <p>The District needs new houses, and the new houses are targeted for first time buyers and young professionals, then this location, near Rochford train station and near existing residential settlement appears to be a good location as many commuters will be able to walk to the station rather than further congest the roads.</p> <p>West Rochford – WR2</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Ltd state that there is capacity available to serve the proposed growth.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will have to consider a number of factors in determining the most appropriate sites within this general location. The Sustainability Appraisal of the options will address these in detail. In general however, the option of directing development away from the existing town and to an isolated, detached site performs poorly when assessed against social, economic and environmental factors.</p> <p>Comment noted. The area at risk of flooding is such that the residential development and school could be accommodated in the site on land outside of the Flood Zone. Areas within the flood zone will be used for less vulnerable uses and/or water-compatible development such as open space. The development must also provide Sustainable Drainage Systems to alleviate flooding issues.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Concerns expressed with regard to loss of Green Belt and agricultural land, impact on infrastructure particularly the highway network, and the impact on services.</p> <p>Community cohesion would be difficult between the new development and the existing community and two separate communities would be formed.</p> <p>West Rochford – WR3</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Ltd state that there is capacity available to serve the proposed growth.</p>	<p>The majority of land surrounding Rochford is Grade 1 Agricultural Land. Land to the west is a mixture of Grade 1 and Grade 2; land to the east is predominantly Grade 1 with the exception of the area of non-agricultural land occupied by an industrial estate. This option encompasses Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land. Agricultural land classification is one consideration in determining the most sustainable locations for development.</p> <p>New infrastructure will be required to be implemented alongside new development, as identified in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure has been considered at the Core Strategy stage. However, it should be noted that this option, being detached from the existing town and further from the train station and town centre, has the potential to generate a greater number of car journeys than other options within this location.</p> <p>Comment noted. The separation of the site from Rochford would make the integration of the new development with the existing community challenging.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>General comments were as per WR1 and WR2 with regard to loss of Green Belt and agricultural land, impact on infrastructure particularly the highway network, and the impact on services such as Doctors and Dentists.</p>	<p>This option is on grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). The majority of land surrounding Rochford is Grade 1 Agricultural Land. Land to the west is a mixture of Grade 1 and Grade 2; land to the east is predominantly Grade 1 with the exception of the area of non-agricultural land occupied by an industrial estate. Agricultural land classification is one consideration in determining the most sustainable locations for development.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>There will be difficulties in providing a defensible Green Belt boundary to the north with this option.</p> <p>West Rochford – WR4</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Ltd state that there is capacity available to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>General comments were as per WR1, WR2 and WR3 with regard to loss of Green Belt and agricultural land, impact on infrastructure particularly the highway network, and the impact on services such as Doctors and Dentists.</p> <p>There will be difficulties in providing a defensible Green Belt boundary to the north with this option.</p> <p>The Environment Agency note that this option minimises flood risk issues.</p> <p>This option would result in ribbon development along Hall Road.</p>	<p>New infrastructure will be required to be implemented alongside new development, as identified in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the future. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stage of the Allocations DPD can provide this.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This option is on grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). The majority of land surrounding Rochford is Grade 1 Agricultural Land. Land to the west is a mixture of Grade 1 and Grade 2; land to the east is predominantly Grade 1 with the exception of the area of non-agricultural land occupied by an industrial estate. Agricultural land classification is one consideration in determining the most sustainable locations for development.</p> <p>New infrastructure will be required to be implemented alongside new development, as identified in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the future. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stage of the Allocations DPD can provide this defensibility.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>This option is not in accordance with guidance issued in Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>West Rochford – Are these the right options?</p> <p>These are not the best options; full costed studies had not been carried out to determine total infrastructure impacts to the area and there was no explanation as to how infrastructure improvements would be funded.</p> <p>Brownfield sites would be more suitable and Green Belt land should not be released.</p> <p>Development of these options would exacerbate existing traffic issues.</p> <p>West Rochford – Should other sites in this location be considered?</p>	<p>Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12 sets out government policy on producing Local Development Frameworks. The PPS explains what local spatial planning is, and how it benefits communities. It also sets out what the key ingredients of local spatial plans are and the key government policies on how they should be prepared. The PPS is primarily concerned with how Development Plan Documents are produced, rather than their contents. This option does not conflict with the guidance in PPS12</p> <p>Detailed assessments will be carried out at a later stage of the Allocations DPD. Assessments have been carried out on each of the options and the Council has worked with service providers to ensure that sites are deliverable, and infrastructure can accommodate them.</p> <p>Brownfield sites have been assessed in the Employment Land Study and the SHLAA for their suitability and sustainability for residential development. The Core Strategy DPD and the evidence base which supports it justifies why a small amount of Green Belt is required to be reallocated during the plan period.</p> <p>The general locations have been determined in conjunction with Essex County Council who are the highways authority for the District. Improvements to the highway network have been identified in the Core Strategy DPD.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Only brownfield sites and sites used for existing industrial usage should be developed.</p> <p>This location should not be considered at all, and smaller sites across the District should be considered instead of larger sites.</p> <p>The area should be extended slightly.</p>	<p>Brownfield sites have been assessed in the Employment Land Study and the SHLAA for their suitability and sustainability for residential development. The Core Strategy DPD and the evidence base which supports it justifies why a small amount of Green Belt is required to be reallocated during the plan period.</p> <p>The Core Strategy considered small sites spread across the District at the Issues and Options stage and the Sustainability Appraisal of this document found that the most sustainable option was several larger sites. The general locations identified in the Core Strategy and subsequently the Allocations DPD: discussion and consultation document are supported by Sustainability Appraisal and are considered to be the most sustainable given the alternatives.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>West Hockley</p> <p>This area is totally wrong for a major development of 50 dwellings. All roads that surround these sites are totally unsuitable to support the development. Folly Lane, Fountain Lane and Church Road, are narrow and are currently not able to support further traffic. These roads are already being used to excess to avoid the congestion on the B1013 from Rayleigh to Hockley, which is claimed to be running at capacity.</p> <p>Development must be of a high standard, and it must be verified that the highway network has capacity for additional dwellings prior to development taking place.</p> <p>Development of any additional housing in the area is not supported for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no proposed solution to traffic issues on the already busy roads 	<p>The general locations have been identified through the Core Strategy. The impact on highways will be addressed in conjunction with Essex County Council Highways – mitigation and improvements will be provided where necessary.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The development of additional dwellings in this general location was determined through the Core Strategy, which was produced with the involvement of Essex County Council Highways</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>around Church Road, Folly Lane and Fountain Lane, which are dangerous, narrow, winding and used by many horse riders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no proposed solution to traffic issues at Hockley primary school caused by 'school runs' due to the additional children <p>However, if development is enforced, then Option WH2 (mushroom farm – brownfield site) is preferred as it avoids the loss of Green Belt and open spaces.</p> <p>The land surrounding Hockley Primary School is used by the pupils of the school for educational walks.</p> <p>The area of search for an allocation of 50 dwellings to West Hockley is too narrow. It is suggested that the broad area of interest be extended to include a greater extent of land to the west of Hockley.</p> <p>The Hockley Parish Plan clearly states that large development in Hockley is not supported.</p>	<p>Highway improvements will be required for development in this location – as stated within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>In identifying the most suitable site to be allocated, impact on the highway network will be a consideration (having regard to representations from Essex County Council Highways).</p> <p>Comments noted with regards to WH2. However, it should be noted that although Option WH2 is not greenfield, it is still allocated as Green Belt. Greenfield is a description of land, whereas Green Belt is a planning policy designation.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Alternative sites put forward which could be considered commensurate with the West Hockley general location will be considered.</p> <p>The Hockley Parish Plan is part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework.</p> <p>The Hockley Parish Plan states that, apart from starter homes, there is very little support for additional housing. The Parish Plan states that if development cannot be avoided in Hockley, it should be directed to existing residential or industrial sites and accompanied by the required infrastructure. The Council have sought to explore opportunities for utilising existing residential and employment sites for development – as set out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and which will be addressed through the Hockley Area Action Plan – but the requirement to reallocate Green Belt land to meet the District’s needs remains.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>West Hockley – WH1</p> <p>The development of any additional housing in the area is not supported for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no proposed solution to traffic issues on the already busy roads around Church Road, Folly Lane and Fountain Lane, which are dangerous, narrow, winding and used by many horse riders. • There is no proposed solution to traffic issues at Hockley primary school caused by 'school runs' due to the additional children <p>Folly Chase is a private road and as such development would not be sustainable if this route was used as an access point.</p> <p>Essex County Council indicated that an archaeological investigation would be required.</p> <p>Access and egress from the site will impact on traffic movements.</p> <p>West Hockley – WH2</p> <p>This will require builders of the highest integrity and not the shoddiest of big national housebuilders. The highest quality materials and most generous dimensions should be enforced by RDC, who should refuse a blanket of white up.</p>	<p>As part of the balanced approach set out in the Core Strategy, Hockley has been allocated development to meet the District’s housing needs.</p> <p>If this site were to be allocated for residential development, highway improvements would be required, as acknowledged in the Core Strategy. The Council have engaged with Essex County Council to ensure that any site allocated will be acceptable from a highways perspective. The details of any improvements would be determined in collaboration with Essex County Council Highways if the site were to come forward.</p> <p>Comment noted. This would be addressed in conjunction with Essex County Council Highways.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. This would be addressed in conjunction with Essex County Council Highways.</p> <p>The design of any development coming forward will be managed through the development management process.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Object to the release of Green Belt and the quantum of houses suggested.</p> <p>There are not enough options, just variations on one option.</p> <p>West Hockley – WH3</p> <p>General comments were as per WH1 and WH2 regarding concern over loss of Green Belt, impact the additional dwellings will have on the highway network, the impact the additional dwellings will have on the rural character of the village, and the loss of footpaths around Hockley Primary School.</p> <p>It was noted that the site is used for agricultural purposes including growing crops.</p> <p>Access to the site is of concern.</p> <p>No defensible Green Belt boundary with this option.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy DPD and the evidence base which supports it justifies why a small amount of Green Belt is required to be reallocated during the plan period. Furthermore as part of the balanced approach set out in the Core Strategy Hockley has been allocated development to meet its needs.</p> <p>Comment noted. Any alternative sites put forward will be assessed and the results published.</p> <p>This option entails the reallocation of less Green Belt land than other options. However, unlike other potential sites, Option WH3 is entirely greenfield. Furthermore, it encroaches further north into the Green Belt than other options.</p> <p>With regards to footpaths, a public footpath runs along the western edge of the site, and if this site were to come forward for development, the footpath could remain.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is acknowledged that vehicular access in particular to the site may be challenging.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the future. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stage of the Allocations DPD can provide this defensibility.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Anglian Water Services Ltd state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades would be required to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>West Hockley – WH4</p> <p>General comments were as per WH1, WH2 and WH3 regarding concern over loss of Green Belt, impact the additional dwellings will have on the highway network, the impact the additional dwellings will have on the rural character of the village, and the loss of footpaths around Hockley Primary School.</p> <p>The use of Folly Chase as an access point.</p> <p>It would be difficult to provide a defensible Green Belt boundary to the north of the site.</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Ltd state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades would be required to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>West Hockley – WH5</p> <p>It is better to develop larger sites than infill sites in town centres.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Option WH4 is entirely greenfield. However, it does not encroach into the open countryside to the north as much as other options.</p> <p>With regards to footpaths, a public footpath runs along the western edge of the site, and if this site were to come forward for development, the footpath could remain.</p> <p>The Council are working closely with Essex County Council Highways to ensure that any sites allocated reflect the impact on highways, and that any impact is mitigated.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the future. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stage of the Allocations DPD can provide this.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted. Any development within the centre of Hockley, however, will be determined through the Hockley Area Action Plan.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>This would be a more suitable option as there was existing access to the site, and did not utilise Green Belt land.</p> <p>The impact additional dwellings would have on the highways network.</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Ltd state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades would be required to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>This option is supported.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council are working closely with Essex County Council Highways to ensure that any sites allocated reflect the impact on highways, and that any impact is mitigated.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>West Hockley – Are these the right options?</p> <p>No development should be allowed that impacts on Green Belt land.</p> <p>Hockley should not be a location for additional development as the highways network is at capacity, and additional development would have a negative impact on the rural character of the area.</p> <p>The sites within the Allocations DPD were inappropriate and brownfield sites should be used elsewhere in the District.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy DPD and the evidence base which supports it justifies why a small amount of Green Belt is required to be reallocated during the plan period.</p> <p>Transport is a significant consideration for any of the sites that have been taken forward within the Allocations DPD. The impact of additional development on the area has been considered on a location by location basis, and on a cumulative basis, and Appendix H2 of the Core Strategy outlines the infrastructure requirements that are necessary before development takes place.</p> <p>Brownfield sites have been assessed and considered within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), and the Council wish to ensure these sites are delivered where possible prior to any Green Belt release through the ‘Plan Monitor Manage’ approach.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Development should not result in the loss of open space and foot paths utilised by Hockley Primary School.</p> <p>West Hockley – Should other sites in this location be considered?</p> <p>Only sites with existing industrial usage should be considered.</p> <p>No sites in the District should be considered until improvements are made to the highway network.</p> <p>Several sites were suggested for further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Mixed support for the options of spreading the developments across a number of sites or developing one larger site.</p> <p>South Hawkwell – 175 dwellings</p> <p>Housing need for Hawkwell is less than 175 dwellings, and as such the quantum of housing proposed is unsustainable.</p> <p>The existing highway networks and infrastructure are at capacity and any additional development should mitigate against its impact.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Improvements to the highway network during the plan period are identified in the Core Strategy DPD. The Core Strategy proposes that developers be required to make financial contributions towards such improvements. As such, it is unlikely to be feasible for infrastructure improvements to come forward independently of development.</p> <p>These will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The housing numbers and general locations were determined through the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Transport is a significant consideration for any of the sites that have been taken forward within the Allocations DPD. The impact of additional development on the area has been considered on a site by site basis, and on a cumulative basis, and Appendix H2 of the Core Strategy outlines the infrastructure requirements that are necessary before development takes place.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The location has the capacity to accommodate more dwellings than the 175 proposed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The density of any development will be determined on a site by site basis. However, it is important that not only Green Belt land only be reallocated as necessary, but also that character of the area is respected.</p>
<p>The loss of land designated currently as Green Belt.</p>	<p>Furthermore, the Core Strategy has only accounted for 175 dwellings from Green Belt in this location, and the provision of a greater number may have a destabilising influence on the balanced approach between housing and employment.</p>
<p>Sites proposed in the Allocations DPD are unsuitable, and alternative options were suggested.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>The location is a habitat for Muntjac deer which must be carefully considered.</p>	<p>These alternatives will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p>
<p>There are empty properties that are not being sold in the area, and it was questioned why therefore there was a need for more dwellings.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This would be considered at next stage of the Allocations DPD and through the planning application process.</p>
<p>Where will the residents of the new dwellings be employed?</p>	<p>The requirements of the East of England Plan are expressed in net additional dwellings, and do not include empty homes. Strategic Housing Market Assessments (which evidence the need for additional homes) consider the number of vacant dwellings in their calculations. It should be noted that the Allocations DPD plan document is seeking to ensure housing provision in the long-term.</p>
<p>The capacity of existing services such as doctors and dentists.</p>	<p>The provision of additional employment land is considered within this document and the Core Strategy.</p>
<p></p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council has been and will continue to work with service providers throughout the development of the Local Development Framework to ensure that infrastructure is provided to meet the needs of the local community.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The location of the development would result in coalescence with Rochford.</p> <p>It makes no sense to locate the proposed 175 homes in one of four locations that are all off of Rectory Road, which has an inadequate roundabout at one end and single file under a narrow railway bridge via traffic lights at the other.</p> <p>Any development would require archaeological investigations.</p> <p>Only one option with small variation had been put forward and more options should have been considered.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should have been considered first.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the housing across the District should have been considered.</p>	<p>Development within the general location would not necessarily engender coalescence with Rochford, given the amount of Green Belt land that would continue to separate the two settlements. The issue of avoiding coalescence is one which must be considered when identifying a specific site for allocation within the general location.</p> <p>Transport is a significant consideration for any of the sites that have been taken forward within the Allocations DPD. The impact of additional development on the area has been considered on a site by site basis, and on a cumulative basis, and Appendix H2 of the Core Strategy outlines the infrastructure requirements that are necessary before development takes place.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Alternative sites that were previously put forward were considered and an assessment of these is set out in Appendix 1 of the Discussion and Consultation Document. Additional sites that were put forward during consultation on the Discussion and Consultation Document will be assessed, and the results published.</p> <p>Brownfield sites have been assessed for their suitability for reallocation for residential development within the SHLAA. The Council seek to ensure that such previously developed land is delivered before Green Belt land wherever possible.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the housing proposed for the future has been considered as part of the development of the Core Strategy DPD. The Allocations DPD is concerned with the specific sites, and must conform to the Core Strategy.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>South Hawkwell – SH1</p> <p>There is a gas pipe running through the site which would need to be accounted for.</p> <p>Pressure on infrastructure, loss of Green Belt, coalescence, and an inappropriate location for development.</p> <p>The mature trees on the site must be considered.</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Ltd state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth at this location.</p> <p>Coalescence of Hawkwell and Hockley.</p>	<p>This is correct and would need to be taken into account in the layout of any planning application.</p> <p>The Core Strategy considered such issues in determining South Hawkwell as a general location for 175 additional dwellings. There would be no coalescence of settlements arising from development in this location.</p> <p>Yes, absolutely - such issues will be considered at the next stage of the Allocations DPD and through the planning application process.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Hockley is located to the north of Hawkwell, and the settlements adjoin one another. Development to the south of Hawkwell would not contribute to coalescence of Hockley and Hawkwell.</p>
<p>South Hawkwell – SH2</p> <p>Comments on this option were generally as per SH1 with regard to concerns over infrastructure, loss of Green Belt, coalescence, and inappropriate location.</p> <p>SH2 would be the preferred option as the wooded area to the north of the site would be retained.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy considered such issues in determining South Hawkwell as a general location for 175 additional dwellings. There would be no coalescence of settlements arising from development in this location.</p> <p>It is agreed that the natural woodland part of this location should be retained and preferably incorporated into the development.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Anglian Water Ltd stated that Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth for all sites.</p> <p>Essex County Council stated that archaeological evaluation would be required in this location.</p> <p>This option leaves out large areas of woodland and ecology that would otherwise be positively managed should an application be submitted. The lines within option SH2 appear arbitrary. Consideration needs to be given to the relocation of the gas pipeline which extends outside of SH2 to the north and the full extent of the woodland Tree Preservation Order. Unless the full extent of land is included as per SH1 plus the land adjoining Thorpe Road/Close, then any proposals submitted would not be able to properly consider ecology, landscape, pipeline relocation, sustainable drainage or appropriate means of movement.</p> <p>The Environment Agency note that some flood zone is associated with this option, but it represents a better option with regards to flood risk than Option SH1.</p> <p>The inclusion of an area of land to the south of Rectory Road would erode the open gap between Hawkwell/Hockley and Southend on Sea which Green Belt in this area seeks to preserve for coalescence reasons. A defensible Green Belt boundary would be difficult to identify. Integration of the area south of Rectory Road would be difficult and so would not be sustainable.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>It is agreed that the natural woodland part of this location should be retained and preferably incorporated into the development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>It is not agreed that development in this location will have any impact on the gap or on coalescence between Hockley/Hawkwell and Southend. The Upper Roach Valley is the south and this has been identified as an area where no development should take place. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary is identified and maintained when a site is allocated and is not considered to be a problem in this location..</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>This option excludes large areas of woodland which would result in a lost opportunity for these to be positively managed.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd stated that Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth for all sites.</p> <p>South Hawkwell – SH3</p> <p>Comments on this option were generally as per SH1 with regard to concerns over infrastructure, loss of Green Belt, coalescence, and inappropriate location.</p> <p>The inclusion of land to the south of Rectory Road would erode the open gap between Hawkwell/Hockley and Southend on Sea which Green Belt in this area seeks to preserve for coalescence reasons.</p> <p>Difficult to provide a defensible Green Belt boundary at this site.</p> <p>This option is preferred if development is to happen.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd stated that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth for all sites</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>An alternative view expressed was that the omission of these areas would ensure their protection as they would be remain in Green Belt. However, it should be noted that simply because a woodland is in Green Belt, does not mean it is afforded any greater degree of statutory protection – as trees (depending on their status) may be removed outside of the planning process.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>The Core Strategy considered such issues in determining South Hawkwell as a general location for 175 additional dwellings</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the future. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stage of the Allocations DPD can provide this defensibility.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>South Hawkwell – SH4</p> <p>Comments on this option were generally as per SH1 in regard to concerns over infrastructure, loss of Green Belt, coalescence, and inappropriate location.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd stated that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth for all sites.</p> <p>The inclusion of land to the south of Rectory Road would erode the open gap between Hawkwell/Hockley and Southend on Sea which Green Belt in this area seeks to preserve for coalescence reasons.</p> <p>Difficult to provide a defensible Green Belt boundary at this site.</p> <p>This option would take the heart out of Hawkwell.</p> <p>South Hawkwell – Are these the options that should be considered?</p> <p>No options in South Hawkwell should be considered as it is an inappropriate location for housing development.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy considered such issues in determining South Hawkwell as a general location for 175 additional dwellings. There would be no coalescence of settlements arising from development in this location.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>It is not agreed that development in this location will have any impact on the gap or on coalescence between Hockley/Hawkwell and Southend. The Upper Roach Valley is the south and this has been identified as an area where no development should take place.</p> <p>It is not accepted that it will be difficult to identify a defensible boundary in this location, but it is accepted that it is important to do so. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stage of the Allocations DPD can provide this.</p> <p>It is not clear what this comment refers to, but the proposed location for development is on the southern edge of the built-up area of Hawkwell.</p> <p>This comment does not explain why south Hawkwell is an inappropriate location for development, but the Council has developed a balanced approach to the provision of housing across the District within the Core Strategy. This approach is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base documents.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The options proposed are variations of one option and additional locations should be considered.</p> <p>South Hawkwell – Should other sites be considered?</p> <p>No sites within Hawkwell should be considered.</p> <p>Only sites with existing industrial use be considered.</p> <p>No dwellings should be constructed until infrastructure is upgraded.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Additional sites have been put forward as part of the consultation and these will be considered at the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The Council has developed a balanced approach to the provision of housing across the District within the Core Strategy DPD. This approach is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base documents.</p> <p>The Core Strategy DPD and the evidence base which supports it justifies why a small amount of Green Belt is required to be reallocated during the plan period.</p> <p>The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place to serve the proposed growth. The Core Strategy proposes that developers be required to make financial contributions towards such improvements. As such, it is unlikely to be feasible for infrastructure improvements to come forward independently of development.</p>
<p>East Ashingdon – 100 dwellings</p> <p>The impact increased levels of traffic from new development would have on roads – in particular Brays Lane.</p>	<p>Highway improvements will be required – as set out in the Core Strategy – and the Council will work with Essex County Council Highways to realise these. Since the last round of consultation on the Allocations DPD, a planning application was submitted (ref. 11/00315/OUT) for residential development at a site within this general location, which considered and addressed such issues in detail.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Impact additional residents would have on school places.</p>	<p>The Council has worked closely with Essex County Council Schools Children and Families service to ensure that schools have the capacity to support increased population. Where an increase in capacity has been identified, this has been highlighted in the Core Strategy DPD, and detailed within the Allocations DPD.</p>
<p>A defensible Green Belt boundary was not being provided with some of the options.</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the future. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stages of the Allocations DPD can provide this.</p>
<p>Concern about pedestrian safety in terms of pedestrian access to Brays Lane and Ashingdon Road.</p>	<p>The Council will work with Essex County Council Highways to ensure that any future development includes safe pedestrian access.</p>
<p>Development should not be north of Brays Lane – will not provide a defensible Green Belt boundary and is an unnecessary use of Green Belt land.</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the future. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stages of the Allocations DPD can provide this.</p>
<p>Essex County Council state that an archaeological survey would be required.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>East Ashingdon – EA1</p>	
<p>Number of Heavy Goods Vehicles using Brays Lane and how this would integrate with the school and associated pedestrian movements.</p>	<p>The Council will work with Essex County Council Highways to ensure that any future development includes safe pedestrian access and that the new access to the school is appropriate.</p>
<p>Anglian Water Services state that there is capacity available to serve the proposed growth.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>East Ashingdon – EA2</p> <p>This location is further from Rochford Town Centre and train station than other options that are being considered for Rochford, which are considered to more sustainable development options.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd state that there is capacity available to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>This is the most suitable of the three options identified by the Council. However, the site area is not sufficient to deliver a high quality scheme which meets the Council's standards and wider requirements. The site area should be amended to include additional land to the north.</p> <p>East Ashingdon – EA3</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd state that there is capacity available to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>Are these sites the most suitable for development in this location?</p> <p>Alternative brownfield sites are available that are more suitable.</p> <p>Several other sites were suggested for consideration as alternatives.</p>	<p>Whilst the general location of South East Ashingdon is further to the north of the town centre and train station than some of the other options for Rochford/Ashingdon, this area is well located to the parade of shops at Golden Cross. The identification of this general location is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will ensure a high quality scheme is delivered whilst protecting Green Belt as far as practicable.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Brownfield sites have been assessed for their suitability for reallocation for residential development within the SHLAA. The Council seek to ensure that such previously developed land is delivered before Green Belt land.</p> <p>These will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>South West Hullbridge – 500 dwellings</p> <p>This is an entirely inappropriate development for such a small village. Much of Hullbridge is made up of unmade or unadopted roads that simply could not cope with the demands of traffic. Many roads do not have surface water drains. The village is a mix of old and new properties, an entirely new housing estate on the outskirts of the village would be isolated.</p> <p>This location would have a negative impact on current residents of Hullbridge in terms of space and views and loss of Green Belt land; loss of wildlife natural habitat; lack of suitable infrastructure including roads, transport, medical facilities, shopping facilities etc; flooding potential.</p> <p>The area needs improvement and investment and the options are supported.</p>	<p>The principle of 500 additional dwellings in South West Hullbridge has already been assessed through the Core Strategy process and found to be a sustainable and appropriate approach when considered against alternatives.</p> <p>It is important that new development is not isolated from the rest of Hullbridge – this will be reflected in the details of any design.</p> <p>Although no one has a right to a view over someone else’s land, any scheme will be required to be implemented in a manner that gives consideration on the amenity of existing residents, avoids overlooking of private gardens, etc.</p> <p>The area to the South West of Hullbridge is not identified as being of ecological importance. However, any impact identified on wildlife habitats will be required to be addressed.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure will be required to serve any new development in this location, as set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>South West Hullbridge – SWH1</p> <p>Concern regarding flooding - the area regularly floods without additional development exacerbating this.</p> <p>The roads are too narrow and many of them are unmade and would not cope with additional traffic movement.</p> <p>The impact this development would have on services including doctor's surgeries, water, electricity, gas, and drainage.</p> <p>That there are no secondary schools in Hullbridge.</p>	<p>The general location of South West Hullbridge is not situated within an area at risk of flooding as defined by the Environment Agency i.e. flood Zone 2 or 3. Furthermore surface water flooding is now the responsibility of Essex County Council. This issue has been considered within the Core Strategy DPD and Sustainable Drainage Systems will be required within any development coming forward.</p> <p>As identified within the Core Strategy, highway improvements will be required for any development coming forward in this general location.</p> <p>The issue regarding narrow unmade roads in Hullbridge is recognised. It may not be appropriate to create new vehicular access from the new development onto the existing road network to the east of the options – depending on the site ultimately identified new vehicular links to the south only may be the most appropriate approach, with pedestrian/cycle links to the east.</p> <p>Service providers have been consulted during the preparation of the Core Strategy DPD and this document. The Core Strategy requires new infrastructure to accompany development where required.</p> <p>The Council has worked closely with Essex County Council Schools Children and Families service throughout the production of the Core Strategy DPD and this document to ensure that schools have the capacity to support increased population, and if not where was the most appropriate site to locate any new educational facilities. Provision for increased capacity at existing secondary schools has also been accounted for.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Anglian Water Ltd stated that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p>
<p>The exact infrastructure improvements required and the specific locations need to be specified within the document.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The general requirements are outlined in Appendix H1 and Policy T2 of the Core Strategy DPD. This will be further developed at the next stage of the Allocations DPD and during the planning application process.</p>
<p>Highway capacity figures are required in order to enable respondents to make a judgement.</p>	<p>Essex County Council monitor highway capacity and publish the information and data through Transport Monitoring Reports. However, the regular monitoring does not include detailed assessment of minor roads within the District.</p>
<p>How the Council can specify that Sustainable Drainage Systems can be required from development when there are as yet no site plans available.</p>	<p>The Council worked with Essex County Council to ensure that the general locations and numbers for housing were acceptable from a highways perspective, and to determine the strategic highway improvements that would be required to accompany development. The specifics of highway improvements will be determined on a site-by-site basis.</p>
<p>How the Council can specify that Sustainable Drainage Systems can be required from development when there are as yet no site plans available.</p>	<p>The requirement to provide Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) to manage surface water is identified in Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk. As such this requirement has been factored into the Core Strategy DPD and this document.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>South West Hullbridge SWH2</p> <p>This option does not enable community cohesion.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd stated that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>General comments were as per SWH1.</p> <p>There is a disproportionate number of dwellings to the current village size.</p> <p>South West Hullbridge – SWH3</p> <p>This option is more deliverable, with a smaller impact on the existing village.</p> <p>Accessibility to public transport services.</p>	<p>The site option SWH2 is immediately adjacent to the existing, established community. Development at this location would have the potential to integrate with the existing community. It would be important to ensure that any development of this site is designed in such a way as to provide links between the new development and existing built environment to the east, to ensure the new development is not segregated from the existing community.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council has developed a balanced approach to the provision of housing across the District which has been outlined within the Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Core Strategy requires that residential development in this general location be accompanied by public transport improvements and service enhancements.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>South West Hullbridge – SWH4</p> <p>Expected to be less impact on the highway network with SWH4, but traffic and highway issues are still of concern – this is the best option.</p> <p>Concern that additional dwellings will result in an increased need to police the area.</p> <p>Should other locations be considered?</p> <p>Several alternative options were put forward for consideration.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Highway improvements will be required for any site coming forward in this location, as proposed in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Essex Police Authority are consulted on proposed planning policy. As such Essex Police have the opportunity to influence where development will take place and are also aware of potential areas of future development.</p> <p>These will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p>
<p>Should development be on one site or a selection of sites?</p> <p>Opinion was split as to whether development should be on one site or a number of sites.</p> <p>South Canewdon – SC1</p> <p>Support for this option because it would create an extension to the village community without having a direct adverse impact on access in and around the village as this site would be developed on the two main roads.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The advantage of allocating a larger site is that the development can be comprehensively planned, ensuring the required infrastructure and other facilities (in addition to simply housing) is provided within the development. Larger sites are also more likely to be attractive to public transport and other service providers.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Canewdon Parish Council indicated that during a recent survey 79% of villagers in Canewdon do not want new houses built, and say it would spoil our rural environment. If they are to accept new houses on Green Belt land, they must meet the needs of the community, and be affordable to parishioners. The existing sewage, water, electricity and communications networks must all be improved, as well as public transport, schools and doctors surgery provision. We also need road safety improvements at the junction with Canewdon & Ashingdon road for a mini roundabout plus 40 mph speed limits for Lark Hill & Scotts Hall Road.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd. state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>South Canewdon – SC2</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>South Canewdon – SC3</p> <p>The appropriateness of splitting development across highways.</p> <p>To increase the housing in this area will require the roads to be upgraded as they are at their best rural at their worst damaged and dangerous.</p>	<p>The Council recognise that many people are opposed to the reallocation of the Green Belt. We strongly support the protection of the Green Belt. However, there are insufficient Brownfield sites within the District to meet projected housing needs, therefore some Green Belt land will need to be released. The balanced approach to housing development set out in the Core Strategy – which includes a small proportion of the District’s housing needs being accommodated by development in Canewdon is considered to be the most sustainable and appropriate strategy, and is supported by independent sustainability appraisal (an assessment of the social, economic and environmental implications of policies / strategies).</p> <p>Highway and other infrastructure improvements will be required to accompany any residential development within this location, as set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve the proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with service and infrastructure providers to ensure that these meet the future needs of the local community.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Telephone lines require upgrading – better broadband essential.</p> <p>Investment in the public transport system as this is patchy and at rush hour times useless</p> <p>Splitting the development over several plots involving several landowners may not be sustainable and would not deliver the additional requirements of infrastructure improvements, etc.</p> <p>South Canewdon – SC4</p> <p>South Canewdon does not have sufficient access to a public transport system, and as such there are concerns over increased traffic within Canewdon and on roads into and out of the village.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth</p> <p>Opinion was divided as to which of the four sites was more suitable</p> <p>Should alternative locations be considered?</p> <p>Several alternative options were suggested.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Deliverability is a key issue to demonstrate when identifying sites for future development.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (in which the general locations and numbers of additional dwellings is set out) recognises that public transport provision in Canewdon is generally poor. This is one of the reasons why Canewdon is classified within the Core Strategy’s settlement hierarchy as a ‘third tier settlement’, and why comparatively few dwellings are proposed for the village.</p> <p>The Core Strategy was developed in conjunction with Essex County Council Highways. Highway and public transport improvements will be required to accompany development.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>These will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Anglian Water Ltd state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth</p> <p>The site size is insufficient to accommodate all 500 dwellings.</p> <p>Increased traffic movements.</p> <p>The quantum of development proposed is inappropriate as this location, is away from the main public transport routes, key employment areas and key services and as such would result in a significant increase in car movements across the District.</p> <p>The size of the site would result in a higher density of housing than would be desirable for the location.</p> <p>This option would not allow for the creation of a defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>South East Ashingdon – SEA3</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted. The density of any development will be determined on a site by site basis.</p> <p>The Core Strategy requires local highway capacity and infrastructure improvements accompany any residential development in this general location, including contribution to traffic management of Ashingdon Road.</p> <p>Comments noted. The general location of South East Ashingdon has already been identified and assessed as being appropriate for 500 dwellings. Highway improvements will be required to accompany residential development in this location, as set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>However, it is recognised that Option SEA2 – which does not link to existing development to the south – may offer fewer opportunities to provide links to Rochford town centre.</p> <p>Comment noted. The density of any development will be determined on a site by site basis.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the future. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stages of the Allocations DPD can provide this defensibility.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The settlement is not a primary tier settlement, and as such does not have good access to public transport and other necessary services.</p>	<p>The issue of tiers of settlement was determined through the Core Strategy process. Some of the District's settlements, although they have their own distinct identifies, are not functionally separate from their neighbours and for the purposes of the Core Strategy have been grouped together as one. This includes Rochford/Ashingdon which is considered a primary tier settlement.</p>
<p>South East Ashingdon – – Other comments</p> <p>Existing industrial land would be better used for residential settlement.</p> <p>One alternative site suggested in the general location.</p> <p>West Great Waking – WGW1</p> <p>The land is currently unused, unsightly and is not performing any Green Belt function.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd comment that there are major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>The land south of the High Street (WGW2 (part) is un-used and unsightly land which performs no Green Belt function. The land is well related to the village and enclosed by development on three sides. The site WGW1/2 could be developed to provide 175 dwellings and could be developed along with other land at the disused brickworks and the industrial estate to provide an integrated comprehensive mixed-use scheme including housing, employment, new public open space and a local wildlife site, and would bring environmental benefits to the local community.</p> <p>West Great Waking – WGW2</p>	<p>Existing employment land within the District has been identified for its appropriateness through the Employment Land Study and the SHLAA.</p> <p>These will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Option WGW2 comprises two plots. Development of land to the west of Little Wakering Road would intrude into open countryside, and would harm the openness of the Green Belt. Its western boundary would not be defensible in PPG2 terms; further westerly expansion of development would be difficult to resist.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd. comment that there are major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>West Great Wakering – WGW3</p> <p>This option consisted of unconnected plots which would make it more difficult to form a defensible Green Belt boundary and would also be piecemeal development.</p> <p>This is low lying ground.</p> <p>Suggestions provided to improve the area surrounding the options.</p> <p>SHLAA Sites</p> <p>Rawreth Industrial Estate</p> <p>Rawreth Industrial Estate is already overdeveloped, and so this would be a suitable option for housing, as long as businesses could be relocated.</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the future. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stages of the Allocations DPD can provide this defensibility.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is important that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the future. The Council will ensure that any sites identified in the next stages of the Allocations DPD can provide this.</p> <p>Comment noted. This would have to be considered with any development coming forward.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Rawreth Industrial Estate has been identified as being suitable for reallocation for residential development in the Employment Land Study and the SHLAA. Several options for additional employment land to the west of the District are set out in the discussion and consultation document.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>This site would be more suitable for residential development than Green Belt land and supported the option.</p> <p>The site is in multiple ownership thus the delivery of the site would be more difficult.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of this suggested option and options for North of London Road.</p> <p>The potential loss of business with the redevelopment of this site.</p> <p>Congestion was seen to be an issue at this location currently and there was concern that this would be exacerbated with the redevelopment of this site and the development of a site at North of London Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge that the site will not come forward in the early part of the plan period (it is not included in the five-year land supply). Alternative employment land will be allocated and the Council will work with landowners, developers, business representatives and other stakeholders to ensure this is delivered and that displaced businesses are suitable relocated.</p> <p>Comment noted. This has been considered during the development of the Core Strategy DPD and this document through consultation with infrastructure and service providers. Additional infrastructure to support residential development both on Rawreth Industrial Estate and to the North of London Road have been identified within Appendix H1 of the Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>As set out in the Core Strategy, the Council is committed to ensuring that alternative land is available for any businesses displaced, and to assist businesses in relocating. There are concerns with the quality of the layout of the existing industrial estate and it is felt that a purpose-built, planning employment area at an alternative location (but still within the area), and well related to important highway links, will be a significant benefit to businesses in the long-term.</p> <p>As set out in the Core Strategy, any residential development of this site will be required to be accompanied by highway improvements.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>It may be more beneficial to the local area if this site was developed as a mixed use site rather than purely residential.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>Stambridge Mills</p> <p>Stambridge Mills is located within a flood zone and this was a major concern.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy requires that the redevelopment of the site be accompanied by the provision of open space and play space. In addition, the Core Strategy encourages small-scale retail development to accompany new residential sites, provided such development serves day-to-day needs of local residents and does not undermine the role of the District's town centres.</p> <p>In respect of a mixed-use development encompassing residential and employment uses, the Core Strategy acknowledges that West Rayleigh is an appropriate area for employment, and that land will be allocated for employment development in that location. However, it is also necessary for this future employment area to be capable of accommodating any businesses displaced by redevelopment of Rawreth Industrial Estate. Some of these businesses are not appropriate to locate adjacent to residential dwellings.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the provision of some commercial development on the site should not be ruled out at this stage. It will however be necessary to ensure that the site can still accommodate its contribution towards the District's housing supply, in the form of a high quality design which makes a positive contribution towards the area's character.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p> <p>Stambridge Mills is situated within an area at risk of flooding (flood Zone 2 and 3). Prior to any development coming forward on this site, adequate flood defence measures would need to be in place in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (PPS25).</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The site would be better used for residential purposes.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main settlement of Rochford and from the associated services there.</p> <p>The site would be better allocated for employment uses, particularly light industrial use.</p> <p>An historic building survey would be required, alongside an archaeological survey.</p> <p>Star Lane Industrial Estate</p> <p>The relocation of the existing workforce must be a primary consideration.</p> <p>PPS4 states that sustainably located employment sites should be retained, and the site should be retained for employment use.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The site is detached from the main settlement of Rochford (although the physical distance is not great), but this must be balanced with other considerations, such as the site being brownfield land outside of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council consider – as set out in the Core Strategy – that there are preferable strategic locations for employment in the District, particularly around London Southend Airport. It is also important that plans are deliverable, and it is unlikely that it would viable to develop the site for employment.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. As set out in Rochford District Council's Economic Development Strategy 2009-2013, objectives of the Council's Economic Development Unit include to ensure that the relocation of industrial estates is economically viable and deliverable, to ensure that any intentions in this respect are effectively communicated to the business community so that they can plan for change and also to ensure that those businesses are adequately supported.</p> <p>The Rochford District Employment Land Study included an assessment of the existing employment sites in the District. In the case of Star Lane, it concluded that, given the quality of existing stock is very poor and its strategic location is also poor, Rochford District Council should consider reallocating this site for other uses.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The site is in multiple ownership, making delivery of this option significantly more difficult.</p> <p>The potential contamination of this site is a potential issue.</p> <p>Relocation of this site, together with the additional housing proposed for Great Wakering, would increase the proportion of residents out commuting.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth.</p>	<p>Part of the site is in multiple ownership, whereas a significant area is under single ownership where the owners are actively promoting the site for residential development. With regards to the portion of the site in multiple ownership, alternative employment land will be allocated and the Council will work with landowners, developers, business representatives and other stakeholders to ensure this is delivered and that displaced businesses are suitable relocated.</p> <p>Comment noted. This would need to be taken into consideration during the development management process.</p> <p>The Core Strategy proposes alternative employment land be provided in Great Wakering, as well as in other parts of the District.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p>
<p>Star Lane Brickworks</p> <p>Development of brownfield sites is preferable to the development of Green Belt sites.</p> <p>Contamination of the site.</p> <p>This option supported, particularly as it was seen to be in accordance with PPS3 prioritising the use of previously developed land.</p> <p>The relocation of employment sites would result in additional Green Belt land being lost for employment land which was not supported.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. This would need to be taken into consideration during the planning application process.</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>The reallocation of existing employment land and the need to provide additional employment land is evidenced within the Employment Land Study.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Anglian Water Ltd. state that infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p>
<p>Eldon Way and Foundry Industrial Estates</p>	
<p>Preferable to develop existing industrial estates for housing than release Green Belt.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Such issues will need to be considered when producing the Hockley Area Action Plan.</p>
<p>Hockley is considered to be overdeveloped and thus this option is not supported as the area cannot support additional housing.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Such issues will be considered when producing the Hockley Area Action Plan, particularly the need for any development to be accompanied by the required infrastructure.</p>
<p>The site is in multiple ownership currently and thus delivery would be more difficult.</p>	<p>Comments noted. If the site were to be developed, the Council acknowledge that the site will not come forward in the early part of the plan period. Alternative employment land will be allocated and the Council will work with landowners, developers, business representatives and other stakeholders to ensure this is delivered and that displaced businesses are suitable relocated.</p>
<p>Infrastructure, improved or not, would not be able to cope with any additional development.</p>	<p>The Council have worked with infrastructure and service providers in developing the Core Strategy which set the principle of producing an Area Action Plan for Hockley centre. The Council will continue to work with infrastructure and service providers to ensure that proposals in the Hockley Area Action Plan address infrastructure needs.</p>
<p>The potential for this site to have contamination issues.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This will be considered as part of the Hockley Area Action Plan and, where necessary, the development management process of individual schemes.</p>
<p>The sites has good access to the transport network and Hockley centre.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Gypsy and Traveller Sites</p> <p>It is wrong to identify the needs of a single minority community without identifying the needs of other communities.</p> <p>Where can the evidence base documents be found (in hard copy and online)?</p> <p>The needs, costs and issues involved with the site should be noted within the document.</p> <p>Information should be provided in the document as to the definition of a 'pitch' and the size of the site options shown.</p>	<p>The Council's planning policies seek to address the planning requirements of all members of the community, including Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>The evidence base documents (the Essex Wide Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2006 and the Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2009) can be found within the Council's Evidence Base library both online¹ and at the Rochford District Council offices in Rochford upon request.</p> <p>The Allocations Development Plan Document will allocate land for the site, but it will be implemented privately. The site would not be run by the Council, therefore there will be no public cost in this respect.</p> <p>Comment noted. As noted in the Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (2009) a "pitches often contain more than one caravan, typically two or three" (paragraph 4.3)².</p>
<p>GT1</p> <p>This site would not be large enough to accommodate all the required pitches.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Options include accommodating the required number of pitches on one large site or on several smaller sites.</p>

¹ Rochford District Council's Evidence Base Library
www.rochford.gov.uk/planning_and_building_control/policy/local_development_framework/evidence_base.aspx

² Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2009 www.rochford.gov.uk/PDF/planning_gypsy_accomodation_assessment.pdf

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The option was supported as the site was removed from the main settlement and was also currently being used as a Gypsy and Traveller Site.</p> <p>A better option would be to allocate several smaller or individual sites rather than one larger one.</p> <p>The highways access to the site is a problem.</p> <p>The Environment Agency noted that the site is close to land that is in Flood Zone 2 which must be considered.</p>	<p>Comment noted. However, in the allocation of sites, consideration includes access to GP and other health services, and children attending school on a regular basis. Sites which meet such criteria will often be in proximity to existing residential areas, rather than away from the main settlement.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the fact the site is currently being used as a Gypsy and Traveller site, it is relevant to note that planning permission for 12 residential Travellers Caravans and retention of existing access at the site was refused in 2010 (Ref: 10/00582/COU). The application was subsequently appealed, but the appeal dismissed. Whilst planning applications and the allocation of land are separate matters, the appeal decision shows that this site is not an appropriate one.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. A planning application for the provision of 12 residential Travellers Caravans and retention of existing access at the site was made in 2010 (Ref: 10/00582/COU). The applications was refused and subsequently appealed.</p> <p>In considering the appeal, the Planning Inspector concluded that the proposal would prejudice highway safety along the A1245</p> <p>It is important to note that a planning application and the allocation of land are separate matters. However, the Inspector’s conclusions are still relevant in the consideration of whether the allocation of land would be appropriate.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The site will get larger in size over time.</p> <p>Anglian Water Ltd commented that there are major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth will be required.</p>	<p>Government guidance (contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 – Green Belts) states that it is important that Green Belt boundaries be well-defined, using readily recognisable features where possible to prevent encroachment. This option is bounded to the west by the A1245. Landscape treatment would be required on the other boundaries of an allocation here to ensure any revision to the Green Belt is clearly defined.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in a timely manner to serve any proposed development.</p>
<p>GT2</p> <p>This option is supported as it is located in one place and is partly used as an existing Gypsy and Traveller site.</p> <p>The site is too close to the main settlement of Rayleigh.</p> <p>Access to services, schools and doctors and the highway network from this location.</p>	<p>Comment noted. However, notwithstanding the fact that part of the site is currently being used as a Gypsy and Traveller site, it is relevant to note that planning permission for 12 residential Travellers Caravans and retention of existing access at part of the site was refused in 2010 (Ref: 10/00582/COU). The application was subsequently appealed, but the appeal dismissed. Whilst planning applications and the allocation of land are separate matters, the appeal decision shows that this site is not necessarily an appropriate one.</p> <p>In the allocation of sites, consideration includes access to GP and other health services, and children attending school on a regular basis. Sites which meet such criteria will often be in proximity to existing residential areas.</p> <p>This option is somewhat isolated from the main settlement and services there, although the site is well located in relation to the A1245 and transport network.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Local infrastructure could not support this development.</p> <p>As per GT1 concerns regarding highways access to the site.</p> <p>Conflicting comments as to whether the pitches would be better located on one site or on several sites across the District.</p> <p>The Environment Agency state their concerns over the site being located in Flood Zone 2 and 3, thus not being in line with PPS25 or the emerging Policy H7 of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>The scale of any development is such that impact on local infrastructure is likely to be nominal. However, the Council will continue to seek the views of infrastructure providers on any proposals.</p> <p>Comment noted. A planning application for the provision of 12 residential Travellers Caravans and retention of existing access at the site was made in 2010 (Ref: 10/00582/COU). The applications was refused and subsequently appealed.</p> <p>In considering the appeal, the Planning Inspector concluded that the proposal would prejudice highway safety along the A1245</p> <p>It is important to note that a planning application and the allocation of land are separate matters. However, the Inspector’s conclusions are still relevant in the consideration of whether the allocation of land would be appropriate.</p> <p>Comment noted. It has been identified that there is a small area of Flood Zone 2 and 3 towards the southern extent of this option. This is a factor which will need to be considered in the development of preferred option for the provision of gypsy and traveller accommodation.</p>
<p>GT3</p> <p>The land is currently used for crop growing and was therefore unsuitable.</p> <p>The site is located too close to residential dwellings.</p>	<p>However, it must be borne in mind that sites should be allocated which are deliverable – as land at this option is currently in alternative use, and does not have a history of being promoted for use as a Gypsy and Traveller site, the deliverability of this option is questionable.</p> <p>In the allocation of sites, consideration includes access to GP and other health services, and children attending school on a regular basis. Sites which meet such criteria will often be in proximity to existing residential areas.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Option supported as it was not too close to residential dwellings.</p> <p>This would be the first development people saw when driving into the District and it was felt this may be inappropriate.</p> <p>Highways access to the site and the impact additional traffic movements would have on an already congested network.</p> <p>Several smaller sites would be more appropriate.</p> <p>Proximity of this site to a school.</p> <p>The release of Green Belt inappropriate.</p> <p>GT4</p> <p>The area surrounding this site is mainly unmade roads and as such is unsuitable.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is, however, important to remember that sites should be located with good access to services, in particular schools and healthcare.</p> <p>The landscape character of the area is defined as South Essex Coastal Towns, and is likely to be impacted if this site is allocated as the site is currently open fields and is designated Green Belt.</p> <p>However there are several businesses and buildings within close proximity, including to the west of this option. Nevertheless, the site fronts a prominent road at a gateway into Rayleigh and design and impact on the character of the area must be a consideration.</p> <p>Access to any site would be developed in consultation with Essex County Council Highways to ensure it was appropriate.</p> <p>Impact on highway congestion would be nominal given the scale of development in question.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Good access to schools is a positive, as when allocating sites consideration includes children attending school on a regular basis.</p> <p>Comment noted. However, there is an identified need for Gypsy and Traveller sites in the District, and a lack of alternatives that are not within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Comments noted. Access to the highway network is an important consideration.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
The proximity of this site to residential dwellings.	In the allocation of sites, consideration includes access to GP and other health services, and children attending school on a regular basis. Sites which meet such criteria will often be in proximity to existing residential areas.
Transport issues, including an increase in traffic movements.	Given the scale of development proposed, impact on highway congestion would be nominal.
Access to services from this site, including schools, doctors, amenities etc.	This option is situated outside the settlement boundary of Hockley although there are local services further to the south of the site.
Is the site is connected to water, electricity and sewage services?	The land has been used as a Gypsy and Traveller site in the past, suggesting that it can be used as such, although current deliverability will include other factors, such as whether those with control over the land would be interested in seeing the development realised.
Loss of Green Belt land for the provision of this site.	Comment noted. However, there is an identified need for Gypsy and Traveller sites in the District, and a lack of alternatives that are not within the Green Belt.
The site would be better used for residential purposes rather than a Gypsy and Traveller site.	Comment noted. The Core Strategy does not propose residential development in this general location.
Gypsy and Traveller sites would be better located to the west of the District.	Comment noted. The Core Strategy states that sites will be allocated in the west of the District, where transport links and access to services are better.
This site, in conjunction with GT3 and GT5 were sufficient to provide the required number of pitches.	Comment noted
GT5	

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The site was located too close to residential areas and historic woodland.</p> <p>Transport issues, including an increase in traffic movements.</p> <p>Access to services from this site, including schools, doctors, amenities etc.</p> <p>Is the site connected to water, electricity and sewage services?</p> <p>There were conflicting comments as to whether the pitches would be better located on one site or on several sites across the District.</p>	<p>In the allocation of sites, consideration includes access to GP and other health services, and children attending school on a regular basis. Sites which meet such criteria will often be in proximity to existing residential areas.</p> <p>Impacts on the adjacent wooded area would have to be carefully considered if this option were to be taken forward. The site is not in proximity to Ancient Woodland.</p> <p>Given the potential scale of any development at this site, impact on highway congestion would be nominal.</p> <p>This option is somewhat isolated from the nearest main settlements of Rochford and Ashingdon, and the services there.</p> <p>The land has been used as a Gypsy and Traveller site, suggesting that deliverability is not problematic.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>GT6</p> <p>Too isolated and removed from services.</p> <p>The site was considered to be too large by some respondents.</p> <p>The site was deemed to be an ideal location in terms of access to the highway network by a number of respondents.</p>	<p>This option is somewhat isolated from the main settlement and services there, although the site is well located in relation to the A1245 and A127.</p> <p>The District's requirement could be accommodated by using only part of this site.</p> <p>This site has excellent links to the A1245 and A127 in particular.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The site would be difficult to control and police due to its size and location.</p> <p>Site is too close to the settlement of Rayleigh.</p> <p>GT7</p> <p>Site was too small.</p> <p>Site is too close to the residential settlement.</p> <p>Access to the site and the impact increased traffic movements from the site would have on the road network.</p> <p>The site is on a narrow unmade road, and has no access to services including water, sewage, electricity bringing into question its deliverability.</p> <p>GT – Are these the best locations to consider?</p>	<p>It may be the case that only part of the site be allocated, if this option were to be allocated.</p> <p>This option is somewhat isolated from Rayleigh. In any case, in allocating sites, consideration includes access to GP and other health services, and children attending school on a regular basis. Sites which meet such criteria will often be in proximity to existing residential areas.</p> <p>This site could not accommodate the District's total requirement alone.</p> <p>In allocating sites, consideration includes access to GP and other health services, and children attending school on a regular basis. Sites which meet such criteria will often be in proximity to existing residential areas.</p> <p>Access to any site would be developed in consultation with Essex County Council Highways to ensure it was appropriate.</p> <p>Impact on highway congestion would be nominal given the scale of development in question.</p> <p>Comments noted. Access to the highway network is an important consideration. In terms of other forms of infrastructure, representations have been submitted from those stating that they would be interested in delivery the site, although as a accommodation for Travelling Show People – a separate and distinct use from Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. As such, its deliverability as a site for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation is unclear.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Gypsy and Traveller pitches should not be located in Hockley.</p> <p>Support for different options.</p> <p>All of the options too close to existing residential settlement.</p> <p>GT – Should any other locations be considered?</p> <p>A number of sites were suggested for consideration, including industrial areas and sites close to main routes, and London Southend Airport.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Core Strategy proposes that pitches be directed to the west of the District where transport links and access to services are better.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>In the allocation of sites, consideration includes access to GP and other health services, and children attending school on a regular basis. As such, potential sites will often be located near existing residential areas.</p> <p>Comment noted. These will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD, but it must be noted that the Allocations DPD is required to conform to the Core Strategy, and the Core Strategy sets criteria for the allocations of Gypsy and Traveller sites.</p>
<p>Economic Development</p> <p>How can the Council plan to provide 3000 jobs, and how can it be ensured that the jobs are for local people.</p> <p>How can the Council allocate land for jobs that cannot currently exist.</p> <p>Baltic Wharf</p>	<p>The Council, as the Local Planning Authority, can enable the provision of 3,000 additional jobs through the allocation of the requisite land for employment uses, through planning policies which direct employment generating uses to the most appropriate locations, and which encourage</p> <p>It is important to note that the allocation of land for job number is based on projections up to 2021.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The allocation is considered to be inflexible.</p> <p>The Environment Agency note that the site is within Flood Zone 2/3 and as such vulnerable uses should not be permitted.</p> <p>Purdeys Industrial Estate</p> <p>The site may be contaminated which would need to be considered.</p> <p>The site may be suitable for expansion.</p> <p>Riverside Industrial Estate</p> <p>It was noted by the Environment Agency that the site is located in Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>Brook Road Industrial Estate</p>	<p>The site is subject to, and surrounded by, a number of environmental constraints which must be considered.</p> <p>Comment noted. Only uses within the ‘less vulnerable’ or ‘water-compatible development’ as defined within Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (PPS25) will be permitted. Furthermore docks, marinas and wharves are themselves classified within the ‘water-compatible development’ category (Table D2, Page 26)³.</p> <p>Possible contamination would need to be considered if redevelopment were proposed, depending on the nature of any redevelopment.</p> <p>The expansion of this existing employment site has not been identified within the Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>Comment noted. Only uses within the ‘less vulnerable’ or ‘water-compatible development’ as defined within Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (PPS25) will be permitted. Furthermore docks, marinas and wharves are themselves classified within the ‘water-compatible development’ category (Table D2, Page 26)⁴.</p>

³ Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf

⁴ Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>This would make an ideal residential area.</p> <p>Brook Road Industrial Estate is ideally located in terms of highway access and as such should be promoted.</p> <p>The Environment Agency noted that a small area of the site is in Flood Zone 2.</p>	<p>Existing employment land has been assessed within the Employment Land Study and the SHLAA to identify those sites most suitable to be reallocated for residential development.</p> <p>Comment noted. This existing employment site is considered to be ‘fit for purpose’ and has been identified within the Core Strategy DPD to be retained for employment uses.</p> <p>Comment noted. Only uses within the ‘less vulnerable’ or ‘water-compatible development’ as defined within Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (PPS25) will be permitted. Furthermore docks, marinas and wharves are themselves classified within the ‘water-compatible development’ category (Table D2, Page 26)⁵.</p>
<p>Star Lane Industrial Estate</p> <p>This should not be reallocated due its ideal location, and should instead be allocated for a mixed use development to ensure no loss of employment opportunities.</p> <p>Eldon Way Industrial Estate</p> <p>Support for the reallocation of this industrial estate provided if it was for a mixed use scheme and employment opportunities were not lost.</p> <p>The allocation not supported for the following reasons:</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Any development of Eldon Way Industrial Estate and the Foundry Business Park will be determined through the Hockley Area Action Plan.</p> <p>Any development of Eldon Way Industrial Estate and the Foundry Business Park will be determined through the Hockley Area Action Plan.</p>

⁵ Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement25.pdf

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relocation of Industrial Units to the proposed Airport Business Park to provide space for redevelopment and additional housing in the Town Centre is not supported for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There should be no large housing estates due to lack of infrastructure – There is no proposed solution to traffic issues on the already congested main artery road between Rayleigh and Hockley, i.e. the B1013. – There is no public transport (trains or buses) to support the Airport Business Park – Based on the results of a resident survey in October 2009, seven out of every eight residents in Hockley opposes major redevelopment of Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estates – Based on the results of a resident survey in October 2009, if redevelopment of Eldon Way / Foundry Industrial Estates is enforced, the recommendations for change include a youth centre, a healthcare centre, a community centre and leisure facilities, with only 1% support for housing. – It contradicts RDC's own Retail & Leisure Study 2008 proposal to reclassify Hockley as a District centre - Hockley should be kept as a Village <p>Sufficient space in Hockley and no more is required in Eldon Way.</p> <p>Stambridge Mills</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is important that planning provides for future growth and development, and enables potential opportunities to be realised.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Support for the reallocation of this site to residential.</p> <p>Location in Flood Zone 3, and relative distance from the settlement of Rochford.</p> <p>The site would be better developed for light industrial use, and as a residential development there would be no defensible Green Belt boundary.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Stambridge Mills is situated within an area at risk of flooding (flood Zone 2 and 3). Prior to any development coming forward on this site, adequate flood defence measures would need to be in place in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (PPS25).</p> <p>Stambridge Mills is already outside of the Green Belt. Its allocation for residential use would require an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.</p>
<p>Rawreth Industrial Estate</p> <p>The existing site is occupied by a multitude of established industrial businesses. It is an important local industrial area which provides premises for small businesses, which would be difficult to relocate. The land is likely to be heavily contaminated and would require extensive remediation to support new housing development subject to viability. The site is poorly located in relation to the railway station, Town Centre and the existing bus network. Furthermore, the existing highway already suffers from congestion, and very heavy traffic movement. Residential development is considered to be an unsuitable re-use of the site.</p>	<p>Rawreth Industrial Estate was assessed as part of the Rochford District Employment Land Study. The study (para 7.22 stated the following about the estate:</p> <p>“This is similar to Brook Road with poor quality stock but the adjoining green belt provides an opportunity to develop high quality office stock which is strategically located. We acknowledge that this site has particular environmental issues and has been identified, through the Urban Capacity Study, as a site that may be suitable for housing use. We recommend that the Council consider allowing a reallocation of this site to housing provided that the requisite employment land is provided elsewhere, preferably on a portion of the green belt land West of Rayleigh. This would be while ensuring that the majority of the green belt land is maintained.”</p> <p>The study found that, whilst many of the buildings were good quality, internal access was poor.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
	<p>It is acknowledged that the site is currently home to a number of businesses. However, the layout of the industrial estate, and its proximity to existing residential areas, bring into question the long-term viability of the site for use as employment. The Council's view is that a new, purpose built employment area in a more suitable location would be beneficial to local businesses and economic development generally, in the long-term.</p> <p>As a brownfield site adjacent to existing residential areas, it is considered an appropriate location for housing. The Core Strategy recognises that infrastructure improvements will be required if the site is redeveloped, and includes the requirement for these to accompany any residential development.</p>
<p>Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades are required to serve proposed growth in terms of water services.</p> <p>Additional Employment Sites to be Allocated</p> <p>The general location of West Rayleigh is unsuitable due to the location of residential settlements and schools in the area.</p> <p>Release of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Redevelop the recently vacated Eon Site in West Rayleigh.</p>	<p>The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>The general location of West Rayleigh for additional employment was determined through the Core Strategy, and is in accordance with the recommendations of the Employment Land Study.</p> <p>As identified in the Core Strategy, the District requires additional employment land in the long-term, and there is a lack of available sites outside of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Yes, the site represents a new opportunity. However, it should be borne in mind that the Employment Land Study still recommended additional land would be required for employment in the long-term when this site was still in use.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Increased traffic movements from an industrial site, and the impact an additional site would have on the environment.</p> <p>Why are employment sites were being directed to West Rayleigh when other sites were felt to be more suitable (London Southend Airport)?</p> <p>Why are additional sites were required when other sites in the District are empty or not being used to capacity?</p> <p>Essex County Council had no objection to the general location, although noted that archaeological surveys would be required.</p> <p>E13</p> <p>This site is located too close to residential settlements and schools.</p> <p>This site would add congestion to an already congested traffic system.</p> <p>Impact on the environment and the loss of Green Belt.</p>	<p>The Council will work with Essex County Council to ensure that the allocation of sites is acceptable in terms of its impact on highways.</p> <p>In respect of impact on the environment, the Council are seeking to ensure a balance between environmental, social and economic issues. The Council feel that this is best served in this instance through only allocating additional land for employment where a need has been demonstrated through the Employment Land Study.</p> <p>The area to the north of London Southend Airport will be considered within the London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan.</p> <p>The Employment Land Study has identified that, in the long-term over the plan period, additional land for employment will be required. It is important that the Local Planning Authority does not stifle economic development and growth.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council will work with Essex County Council to ensure that the allocation of sites is acceptable in terms of its impact on highways.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council are seeking to ensure a balance between environmental, social and economic issues. The Council feel that this is best served in this instance through only allocating additional land for employment where a need has been demonstrated through the Employment Land Study.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Support for this site if infrastructure is upgraded accordingly.</p> <p>E13, E14, E15, E16 and E17</p> <p>Loss of existing industry in the area.</p> <p>Transport issues, mainly congestion, and loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>The site is not large enough (E13) for an industrial site and there are other more suitable locations.</p> <p>There is sufficient capacity in water services to accommodate the site.</p> <p>New employment land be developed in conjunction with residential development in the North of London Road location.</p> <p>E18</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Any allocation could incorporate existing businesses, or if this were not possible, the Council would need to assist in the relocation of the existing businesses.</p> <p>These sites relate well to highway infrastructure. The Council will work with Essex County Council to ensure that the allocation of sites is acceptable in terms of its impact on highways.</p> <p>The site is 2.65 ha. The Employment Land Study recommends that land is allocated to match any deallocations of land in the District, plus 2.2 ha. As such, this site has the potential to accommodate projected need, plus some of the land deallocated.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>This possibility must be considered alongside the requirement, as set out in the Core Strategy, for public open space to be provided as a buffer between residential development to the North of London Road and the A1245. In addition, the proposed employment land will be required to accommodate any businesses displaced by the deallocation of Rawreth Industrial Estate. Such businesses include those that it would not be appropriate to include within a mixed use development.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>This location was generally supported however the question of access to public transport from the site was raised.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The provision of public transport provision is likely to be less viable to this site, due to its relative isolation when compared with other options.</p>
<p>North of London Southend Airport</p>	
<p>This option was generally supported although it should be noted that the Environment Agency recognise some of the land is Flood Zone 2 and 3.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Archaeological examination would be needed.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>What is the economic potential of London Southend Airport, and where details regarding this can be found?</p>	<p>As part of work on the London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan, Southend Borough and Rochford District Councils published an evidence base document which included an examination of the economic potential of the airport. This is available via the Council's website: www.rochford.gov.uk (direct link: www.rochford.gov.uk/PDF/JAAP_evidence_base.pdf)</p>
<p>E19</p>	
<p>Loss of Green Belt land, and proximity to a Local Wildlife Site.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Potential impact on the Local Wildlife Site would have to be carefully considered, although proximity to the Local Wildlife Site does not by itself render this option fundamentally inappropriate.</p>
<p>Water services upgrades would be needed to accommodate this option.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place to serve the proposed growth.</p>
<p>E20</p>	

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Loss of Green Belt land, and proximity to a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Water services upgrades would be needed to accommodate this option.</p> <p>Very close to the District Boundary.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Potential impact on the Local Wildlife Site would have to be carefully considered, although proximity to the Local Wildlife Site does not by itself render this option fundamentally inappropriate.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>Comment noted. It is important that the allocation of land does not engender the coalescence of Great Wakering and Southend/Shoeburyness.</p>
<p>E21</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land, and proximity to a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Water services upgrades would be needed to accommodate this option.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place to serve the proposed growth.</p>
<p>E22</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land, and proximity to a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Water services upgrades would be needed to accommodate this option.</p> <p>This option would have less impact than others put forward.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>Comment noted</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>E23</p> <p>This option was supported although the question of its location in terms of access to public transport was questioned.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land, and proximity to a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Water services upgrades would be needed to accommodate this option.</p>	<p>This site would be functionally separate from Great Wakering and likely to be more closely related to Shoebury in Southend Borough, and access to public transport there.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place to serve the proposed growth.</p>
<p>E24</p> <p>This option was supported although the question of its location in terms of access to public transport, and proximity to the District boundary was questioned.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land, and proximity to a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Water services upgrades would be needed to accommodate this option.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This site would be functionally separate from Great Wakering and likely to be more closely related to Shoebury in Southend Borough.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure in place to serve the proposed growth.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Environment</p> <p>The identification of Star Lane Pits as a Local Wildlife Site was supported, and other sites were also suggested.</p> <p>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</p> <p>Why is the Council only looking at areas designated as SSSI? It should be noted within the document that Hullbridge shoreline is a site of archaeological importance.</p> <p>Special Protection Areas</p> <p>This was supported although it was noted that shooting clubs practice in the area.</p> <p>Special Areas of Conservation</p> <p>Natural England noted that the penultimate sentence should refer to the Essex Estuaries as being an SAC rather than an SPA.</p>	<p>Comment noted. A review of the Local Wildlife Sites was undertaken in 2007⁶ and those which have been considered to merit this designation have been included within the Allocations DPD Discussion and Consultation Document. The sites suggested may be considered when this designation is next reviewed.</p> <p>The Council is not only looking at areas designated as SSSI. The shoreline around Hullbridge is currently part of the coastal protection belt, and it is proposed to remain as such.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

⁶ Rochford District Local Wildlife Sites Review 2007 www.rochford.gov.uk/planning_and_building_control/policy/local_development_framework/evidence_base.aspx

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Flooding</p> <p>The Environment Agency stated that Flood Zone 3b needs to be mapped also.</p> <p>Upper Roach Valley</p> <p>This designation could be extended to protect a larger area.</p> <p>Environmental Allocations</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be included within environmental allocations.</p> <p>Coastal Protection Belt</p> <p>This option was supported.</p> <p>Education Allocations</p> <p>It was questioned why the requirements of additional schools were not noted within the document in order to set out the size of the site that would be required to support the school. It should also be mentioned whether the school would have facilities for a swimming pool and whether the school would have facilities that are open to the community outside of school hours.</p> <p>The site North of London Road was generally supported as was the site in West Rochford for future primary school provision.</p>	<p>The Allocations Development Plan Document does not propose to allocate areas at risk of flooding, as this information is provided to us by the Environment Agency on a quarterly basis, and therefore may need to be updated on a regular basis.</p> <p>Comment noted. Whilst the merits of a larger area are acknowledged, it is important that the extent of the area is justified.</p> <p>Brownfield land may be included within environmental allocations where it is merited. For example, the suggested coastal protection belt includes some brownfield land.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Additional schools will be incorporated within the appropriate proposed residential allocations, as set out within these residential options. The precise nature of any school developed – such as the facilities it has – will be for the education authority to decide.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>KES1, KES2 and KES3</p> <p>Opinion was split on these options with objections being that the Options 2 and 3 would be located away from the existing main school buildings and due to the distance would appear as a separate campus, and would result in additional noise and disturbance as the students travel between the buildings. The Options 2 and 3 would involve the development extending further east into the surrounding countryside that the residential areas to the north and south, resulting in urban sprawl, and would not create defensible boundaries, contrary to PPG2. In addition, the options would also conflict with the proposed housing option (SEA2) proposed for South East Ashingdon. However Option KES3 was seen as being only slightly more sustainable as the northern section would be located too far from the school.</p> <p>Greensward School</p> <p>It was noted that Plumberow Primary School was not identified separately from Greensward School.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>There was some concern that new schools would be built when other schools are not at capacity thereby threatening existing schools with closure.</p> <p>There was also some concern regarding additional traffic movements associated with schools.</p>	<p>It is important that this allocation be considered in conjunction with the allocation of land for residential use in the area.</p> <p>The allocation is for education use and does not differentiate between secondary and primary.</p> <p>The Council has worked closely with Essex County Council Schools Children and Families service to ensure that schools have the capacity to support increased population, and if not where was the most appropriate site to locate any new educational facilities.</p> <p>The Council recognise the potential for additional schools to generate additional traffic. As such, all new schools will be required, as set out in the Core Strategy, to devise and implement a green travel plan, which aims to reduce private, single-occupancy car use. In addition, the Council will work with Essex County Council Highways to ensure that the impact of any new development on highways is managed and mitigated.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Open Space</p> <p>Policies were generally supported although several other locations were suggested, and respondents would generally like more areas allocated for public open space. Additional areas suggested include: Stambridge Memorial Hall grounds; Betts Wood; Folly Lane; Gusted Hall area; Belchamps; Battlesbridge Village Green; and Hullbridge Car Park. In addition it was suggested that land South of Nelson Gardens, Hockley Woods and Turret House Open Space should all link up and provide a buffer stretching from rear of Wellington Road where it adjoins B1013 right over to Albert Road and all the way up to and beyond Hockley Woods.</p>	<p>Stambridge Memorial Hall grounds: this area is recognised is being used for outdoor sport in the 2009 Open Space Study, and merits consideration for allocation as open space in order to safeguard its use. The Open Space Study 2009 suggests that the majority of the District has a deficit in open space provision, although when considered by ward there is an identified surplus for Rochford ward.</p> <p>Betts Wood: this site was identified as a natural/semi-natural green space in the 2009 Open Space Study. It was assessed along with other natural / semi-natural green spaces in the District in terms of the condition and maintenance of the main entrance, site boundary, roads/paths and access, planted areas, grass areas, facilities such as bins, seating, toilets, parking, lighting and information provided about the greenspace, and the cleanliness of the site. Betts Wood was found to be poor/very poor when assessed against the aforementioned criteria. However, this does not preclude the site from being allocated as an open space and safeguarded for this use – simply because it is currently of poor quality (or was when the 2009 assessment was undertaken) does not mean that such space is surplus to requirements.</p> <p>Folly Lane: the green space around Folly Lane and Folly Chase, is not thought to be laid as a public garden or for public recreational use (although public footpaths do run through the area). As such, it does not meet the definition of open space as set out in Planning Policy Guidance 17 (PPG17 – Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation).</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
	<p>Gusted Hall area: Gusted Hall wood is proposed to be allocated as a Local Wildlife Site. In the 2006 Rochford District Replacement Local Plan, the land around Gusted Hall Lane is designated as a Special Landscape Area (designated for their high quality landscape where there is a presumption against inappropriate development therein), and is proposed to be allocated as part of the Upper Roach Valley.</p> <p>Belchamps: the green space at Belchamps, Holly Oak Lane, is managed by Belchamps Scout Centre. As such, public use is restricted. However, the site is used for recreational activities, and has value as such. Allocating the site as open space would help to safeguard its recreational use from other forms of development (although it is already within the Green Belt), and it should be noted that the 2009 Open Space Study suggests that the majority of the District had a deficit in supply of outdoor sports facilities, including Hockley.</p> <p>Land South of Nelson Gardens, Hockley Woods and Turret House Open Space linked up to provide a buffer stretching from rear of Wellington Road: Land South of Nelson Gardens (Fairview Playing Field), Hockley Woods and Turret House Open Space have been identified for allocation as public open space in the Discussion and Consultation Document, and directly to the east of Wellington Road is the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>The areas referred to are in Trinity ward. The Open Space Study identifies that there is a small deficit in natural/semi natural greenspaces, youth facilities and outdoor sports facilities in general within this area, whereas there is a surplus of amenity greenspace and play space. There is potential for open space such as allotments to be designated in this area given the overall deficit within the Rayleigh/Rawreth area, however, a buffer is unnecessary given the proximity of the existing open space to the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Allotments be allocated and included within this policy.</p> <p>A definition of open space be provided within this section in order to enable respondents to differentiate between open space and Green Belt.</p> <p>Glencroft Nurseries open space is in Hawkwell, not Hockley as stated.</p> <p>Open space be protected through a combination of both the development management process on a case by case basis, and through the allocation of sites.</p> <p>Leisure Facilities</p> <p>Options were generally supported and additional locations suggested.</p> <p>It was questioned how the Council can allocate sufficient land for leisure facilities without specifying the enhancements that will be required through the Core Strategy Submission DPD.</p>	<p>The number of allotments in the District has been assessed within the Open Space Study 2009. The Council will require new residential development to be accompanied by open space, and use of part of that allocation could be for allotments. The exact provision of open space will be determined at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Comment noted. Open Space has been defined within the Open Space Study 2009. Green Belt is a land allocation rather than a description of the use of land.</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comments noted. Such an approach would have the advantage of giving a clear indication of the open space in the District, whilst being flexible enough to ensure that if new open spaces were created they would also be protected.</p> <p>Comment noted. These will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The Core Strategy states that the Council will work with its partners to ensure that leisure facilities across the District are maintained and enhanced. It also states that, in particular, the Council will seek to enhance recreational opportunities at Rayleigh Leisure Centre. This does not require additional land to be allocated.</p> <p>The Core Strategy also states that the Council will also look to make the best use of existing facilities in the District by encouraging those such as within school premises to be made accessible to all. Again, this does not require additional land to be allocated for this use.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Community Facilities</p> <p>The options were generally supported and additional locations were suggested for allocation.</p> <p>Rayleigh Towns Sports and Social Club be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>Whilst additional land does not necessarily need to be allocated for additional use, allocating existing land used for leisure as such helps to safeguard their present use.</p> <p>These will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>A range of different community facilities were flagged up as part of this consultation. These ranged in type and scale. However, it may be the case that there are further buildings / land in use as important community facilities that were not put forward as part of the consultation. As such, there is merit in a policy that seeks to protect the provision of existing community facilities generally: this would mitigate the risk of overlooking some existing facilities, and would be more appropriate in the case of very small scale facilities which may not merit particular land-use allocation, but may nevertheless be significant, important facilities.</p> <p>The site is currently within the Green Belt, but within a location which is being considered for allocation for residential development (North of London Road).</p> <p>The Open Space Study notes that there is a deficit of outdoor sports facilities within Rayleigh/Rawreth.</p> <p>A comprehensive redevelopment scheme could provide the club with brand new facilities. Certainty there is no intention whatsoever for the recreational facility or open space to be lost whether new facilities are provided as part of a comprehensive redevelopment or that the existing facilities are simply retained. It would be appropriate for the open space in its current configuration or otherwise to be allocated to ensure that it is safeguarded.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Hockley Fire Station should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>Hockley Fire Station is used for a variety of community uses. Specific allocations that address land in the centre of Hockley, including for community facilities, will be addressed through the Hockley Area Action Plan.</p>
<p>Massive Youth Project should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>Massive Youth Project currently operates out of Eldon Way industrial estate. Specific allocations that address land in the centre of Hockley, including for community facilities, will be addressed through the Hockley Area Action Plan.</p>
<p>Bullwood Hall should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>As a prison, it is not felt that this site would be appropriate to allocate as a community facility.</p>
<p>Ashingdon and East Hawkwell Village Hall should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>Ashingdon and East Hawkwell Memorial Hall is a community facility used for a variety of activities. Within the Replacement Local Plan (2006) the hall, including surrounding playing fields, is allocated as public open space.</p>
<p>Hockley Public Hall should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>Hockley Public Hall is situated towards the northern end of Bullwood Road, Hockley. As such, it is not within the area to be addressed by the Hockley Area Action Plan. Nevertheless, the site is within a residential area and is accessible in terms of its location. The building is used for a variety of activities by the local community, and merits consideration for allocation as community facility in order to safeguard the site for such a use, unless a blanket policy protecting community facilities is to be utilised instead.</p>
<p>Castle Road Hall should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>Castle Hall in Castle Road, Rayleigh is located in proximity to Rayleigh centre, within a residential area, in an accessible location to local residents. It is used for a variety of activities by the local community, and merits consideration for allocation as community facility in order to safeguard the site for such a use, unless a blanket policy protecting community facilities is to be utilised instead.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Grange Community Centre should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>Comment noted – the Allocations Discussion and Consultation Document suggest this site be allocated. The Rayleigh Grange Community Centre is located in an existing residential area, opposite a school, in an accessible location. It is a well used local community facility. This site merits consideration for allocation as community facility in order to safeguard the site for such a use, unless a blanket policy protecting community facilities is to be utilised instead.</p>
<p>Hullbridge Day Centre should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>Hullbridge Senior Citizens Day Centre is located on Windermere Avenue, Hullbridge, just off Ferry Road and to the rear of the Riverside Medical Centre. It is located within an existing residential area and in a relatively accessible location. It merits consideration for safeguarding as a community facility, unless a blanket policy protecting community facilities is to be utilised instead.</p>
<p>Hullbridge Library should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>As a community facility located in an accessible location to the residents of Hullbridge, this site merits consideration for allocation as community facility in order to safeguard the site for such use. In a similar manner, Great Wakering library also merits consideration for allocation as a community facility. Hockley, Rochford and Rayleigh libraries are located within areas to be addressed by respective Area Action Plans.</p>
<p>Riverside Medical Centre should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>The site is in use for healthcare. Whilst an important facility for residents in its own right, healthcare facilities are not considered to merit their own allocation, as the provision through the planning system is determined through separate means; namely health impact assessments.</p>
<p>Hullbridge Garden Association should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>Hullbridge allotments merit consideration for allocation as open space. The shop on Ferry Road is a retail premise and does not warrant allocation as a community facility.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Hullbridge Car Park should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>As a car park, the site is not considered to merit allocation as a community facility.</p>
<p>Hullbridge Scout Hut should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>Hullbridge Scout Hut is located to the rear of St Thomas of Canterbury Church, Thorpedene Avenue. Planning permission for a new scout hut to replace the existing premises was obtained in 2010. It is within a residential area and is accessible in terms of its location. The building is used for activities by the local community, and merits consideration for allocation as a community facility – potentially in combination with the neighbouring St Thomas of Canterbury Church Hall which is also used as a community facility – in order to safeguard the site for such use.</p>
<p>St Thomas’ Church Hall, Hullbridge should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>This site has been utilised for a variety of community uses in recent years, and not simply as a place of worship. The site is adjacent to Hullbridge Scout Hut within a residential area and merits consideration for allocation as community facility – potentially in combination with the Scout Hut to the rear which is also used as a community facility – in order to safeguard the site for such use, unless a blanket policy protecting community facilities is to be utilised instead.</p>
<p>Hullbridge Free Church should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>As a community facility located in an accessible location to the residents of Hullbridge – and well located in relation to potential new residential development – this site merits consideration for allocation as community facility in order to safeguard the site for such use, unless a blanket policy protecting community facilities is to be utilised instead.</p>
<p>Hawkwell Village Hall should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p>	<p>As a community facility located in an accessible location to the residents of Hawkwell and used for a variety of activities, this site merits consideration for allocation as community facility in order to safeguard the site for such use, unless a blanket policy protecting community facilities is to be utilised instead.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Rawreth Village Hall should be added to the list of community facilities that will be safeguarded from development.</p> <p>Cultural facilities be identified and allocated in addition.</p> <p>Town Centres</p> <p>Rayleigh</p> <p>The existing centre boundary be maintained.</p> <p>Rochford</p> <p>The existing centre boundary be maintained.</p> <p>Hockley</p> <p>The existing centre boundaries should be maintained.</p> <p>The exclusion of the shops to the west of Hockley (Option TC8) is not supported - regeneration (not expansion) of this row of shops/businesses must be encouraged without detriment to the village feel.</p>	<p>Rawreth Village Hall is located in the Green Belt. Its importance as a community facility which can be booked and used by the local community for a variety of activities is acknowledged. Although the site is in the Green Belt, its redevelopment was considered appropriate by the Local Planning Authority in 1991, as was an extension granted consent in 2004. As such, there is merit in allocating the land for use as a community facility, whilst maintaining the Green Belt designation to prevent harm to ensure any future development does not undermine the character or openness of the Green Belt, unless a blanket policy protecting community facilities is to be utilised instead</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estates (Option TC8), whether remaining as industrial/leisure or redeveloped for other purposes, should not be included in the town centre boundaries.</p> <p>Support for amending the centre boundary to enclose only the primary shopping areas, as it was felt that this would then allow for some residential development outside of the centre.</p> <p>Eldon Way and Foundry Industrial Estates should not be included within the town centre boundary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no large housing estates due to lack of infrastructure • No proposed solution to traffic issues on congested B1013 • Lack of public transport supporting Airport Park • Resident survey October 2009 shows seven out of eight Hockley residents oppose major redevelopment of Eldon Way/Foundry Estates • Resident survey October 2009 - if redevelopment of Eldon Way/Foundry Estates enforced, recommendations include youth, healthcare, community centres and leisure facilities, with only 1% support for housing. • Contradicts RDC's Retail/Leisure Study 2008 proposal to reclassify Hockley as a District Centre. <p>Reallocation of Hockley as a District Centre</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The possible redevelopment of Eldon Way Industrial Estate and the Foundry Business Park will be determined through the Hockley Area Action Plan.</p> <p>In the meantime, the position of the town centre boundary will be used to direct development appropriate for town centres such as retail, office and leisure uses.</p> <p>Comments regarding the potential to reclassify Hockley centre are noted. The Retail and Leisure Study 2008 states:</p> <p>“We have recommended that Hockley be reclassified as a district centre in accordance with the criteria set out in PPS6. This is not to say that Hockley could not at some point in the future regain town centre status, although this would depend on an expansion of its retail offer.”</p> <p>The Retail and Leisure Study identified a number of opportunities for Hockley, intended to build around its existing strengths and remedy identified weaknesses. The study notes that these will require redevelopment and investment.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>This option should be taken forward and Hockley centre be reallocated as a District Centre.</p> <p>Primary and Secondary Shopping Areas</p> <p>Rayleigh</p> <p>There should be a distinction between primary and secondary shopping frontage areas.</p> <p>Rochford</p> <p>The distinction between primary and secondary frontages should be maintained. The mixed use development in Roche Close must be included in the primary shopping frontage because it contains the supermarket.</p> <p>Hockley</p> <p>Option TC16 (existing primary and secondary shopping frontages) should remain the Primary Shopping Area and encourage minor regeneration and improvements of the secondary frontages. Option TC15 is too restrictive and does not fairly support those shops/businesses away from the centre.</p>	<p>Support noted. Such views will have to be balanced against the potential adverse impact on Hockley centre.</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth states that primary shopping frontage areas “are likely to include a high proportion of retail uses” (Page 26). Secondary shopping frontage areas, however, “provide greater opportunities for a diversity of uses” (Page 26).</p> <p>Consideration will be given to the inclusion of Roche Close within the primary shopping frontage area.</p> <p>The area allocated for the primary shopping area for Hockley must encourage retail uses in the centre, and be capable of accommodating demand for Hockley.</p>
<p>General Comments</p> <p>Clarification is needed as to the distinction between Primary and Secondary Shopping Areas.</p> <p>Other Issues and Next Steps</p>	<p>The difference between primary and secondary shopping frontage areas was explained on Page 136 of the Allocations Discussion and Consultation Document.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Should any other land uses be allocated?</p> <p>Allotments be allocated by several respondents.</p> <p>Health facilities be allocated within the document.</p>	<p>The number of allotments in the District has been assessed within the Open Space Study 2009. The exact provision of open space will be determined at the planning application stage, but the Council supports the principle of identifying land for allotments in association with new housing development.</p> <p>The Council's approach to planning for healthcare provision is set out in the Core Strategy and includes the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist the Primary Care Trust in identifying sites for additional healthcare facilities in the District which are well related to the District's population and in accessible locations, and aid their implementation. • Require new residential developments over 50 dwellings and non-residential developments over 1000 square metres to be accompanied by a Health Impact Assessment and an assessment of their impact on healthcare facilities. Where significant impacts are identified, developers will be required to address negative effects prior to the implementation of development. • Take a positive approach towards proposals for the renovation or replacement of healthcare facilities that become outdated.

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The following land uses should be allocated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sacred (Crematoriums, Cemeteries, Churches). 2. Landmarks (Historical places that are closely associated with a town or village). 3. Mobile Home Parks. <p>Should any sites within Appendix 1 be considered further for allocation?</p> <p>Several options included within Appendix 1 were suggested by respondents for further consideration, including smaller sites to “spread” development, and one large site to accommodate all development.</p>	<p>South East Essex Primary Care Trust is not currently in a position to be able to commit to specific sites for healthcare facilities in the District. Furthermore, the government has proposed to abolish all Primary Care Trusts by 2013, although at the time of writing there is uncertainty as to whether the government intend to proceed with this. The Council propose to adopt a flexible approach to ensure that whatever healthcare structure is in place, the planning process can assist its needs, and that in addition healthcare facilities be provided when a need is identified through health impact assessments.</p> <p>The Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (2006) allocated land for an extension to Hall Road cemetery. However, there is currently no evidence that indicates additional land is required to be allocated for cemeteries.</p> <p>In terms of existing cemeteries, their use as such is safeguarded.</p> <p>The Council is looking to afford a greater degree of protection to landmarks that are of local important through the introduction of the Local List Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>It is not necessary to allocate land for existing mobile home parks (in the same way that it is not proposed to allocate other forms of existing residential areas) and the Core Strategy – which the Allocations Development Plan Document is required to conform to – does not propose any additional mobile home parks.</p> <p>These will be considered within the next stage of the Allocations DPD.</p>

Issue Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>It is the Highways Agency view that in advance of this DPD moving to its next stage, the traffic and transport implications of sites to be taken forward are assessed to an appropriate level of detail. This assessment should be in accordance with the advice issued to Local Planning Authorities in the Eastern Region by the Highways Agency in August 2007, the Department for Transport Circular 02/2007 Planning and the Strategic Road Network and the DfT Guidance on Transport Assessment (March 2007). It is also the Highways Agency view that Local Development Documents that have not been the subject of an assessment of potential transport impact may be regarded as unsound on the grounds of insufficient evidence base.</p> <p>It was questioned how the assessments shown in Appendix 1 were carried out and which benchmarks were used for assessment. There should be a description of how the proforma was used.</p> <p>It was questioned why different types of flooding have not been considered within the assessment.</p>	<p>The Council is working with Essex County Council Highways to ensure the traffic implications of proposals are appropriately addressed. (Note: the Highways Agency is responsible for the motorway and trunk road network – there are no trunk roads in Rochford District).</p> <p>Appendix 1 was produced using data from the Local Development Framework evidence base.⁷</p> <p>The assessment is based on flood risk information supplied by the Environment Agency, which includes fluvial and tidal flooding.</p>

⁷ Available to view via www.rochford.gov.uk, direct link: www.rochford.gov.uk/planning_and_building_control/policy/local_development_framework/evidence_base.aspx, in addition to site visits.