

# Local Development Framework

## Allocations DPD Discussion and Consultation Document – Sustainability Appraisal



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

## **Contents**

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| 1 Introduction .....   | 5           |
| 2 Sustainability Appraisal Methodology .....   | 5           |
| 3 Preparation of the Allocations DPD and SA Report .....   | 7           |
| 4 Allocations SA Scoping Process .....   | 7           |
| Task A1: Reviewing Relevant Plans, Policies and Programmes.....                                    | 8           |
| Task A2: Collecting Baseline Information .....   | 9           |
| Task A3: Identifying the Sustainability Issues and the Appraisal Objectives.....                   | 9           |
| Task A4: Considering Options and Alternatives.....   | 9           |
| Task A5: Developing the SA Framework .....   | 10          |
| Task A6: Consultation on Scope of the Allocations DPD SA .....                                     | 12          |
| 5 Developing and Refining Options and Assessing Effects .....                                      | 22          |
| Task B1: Testing the DPD Objectives Against the SA Framework .....                                 | 23          |
| Task B2: Developing the DPD Options .....  | 23          |
| Task B3: Predicting the effects of the DPD .....   | 25          |
| Task B4: Evaluating the effects of the DPD .....   | 26          |
| Task B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising<br>beneficial effects ..... | 26          |
| Task B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of<br>implementing the DPD .....    | 26          |
| 6 Sustainability Appraisal – Matrices and Summaries .....  | 26          |
| Appendix 1 – Residential Land Allocations – Green Belt Land.....                                   | 116         |
| Appendix 2 – Residential Land Allocations – Reallocated Employment Land .....                      | 582         |
| Appendix 3 – Residential Land Allocations – Gypsy and Traveller Sites .....                        | 642         |
| Appendix 4 – Employment Land Allocations – Existing Employment Land.....                           | 717         |
| Appendix 5 – Employment Land Allocations – Additional Employment Land.....                         | 791         |
| Appendix 6 – Environment Allocations.....  | 927         |
| Appendix 7 – Community Facilities Allocations.....   | 954         |
| Appendix 8 – Town Centre Allocations .....   | 1221        |
| Appendix 9 – Alternative Options .....   | 1378        |



## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 Rochford District Council is at the preliminary stage of preparing the Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), which will form part of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF).
- 1.2 In accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document has been the subject of, and has been produced in conjunction with, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). European and UK legislation require that the LDF is also subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), a process that considers the effects of development planning on the environment. Government guidance advises that these two processes should be carried out together and outlines a number of stages of SA work that need to be carried out as the LDF is being prepared. Government guidance, as detailed further below, also states that SA work should not repeat that carried out at a higher level. As such, this SA incorporates the requirements of SEA and does not repeat the SA/SEA work undertaken on the Rochford District Core Strategy. This SA should be read in conjunction with the SA/SEA of the Rochford District Core Strategy, including addendums to such work.
- 1.3 The purpose of the SA is to ensure that wider sustainability issues, encompassing environmental, economic and social implications of options or policies proposed, are taken into consideration throughout the preparation of Development Plan Documents.
- 1.4 This document combines the initial Scoping Report for the SA which has informed the preparation of the full SA Report for the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document. It has been produced in-house to ensure that the SA process is as integrated with the plan making process as possible.

## **2 Sustainability Appraisal Methodology**

- 2.1 The SA Report has been produced alongside the Discussion and Consultation version of the Allocations DPD, and as such has been undertaken in accordance with the advice set out in the guidance on the preparation of SAs for Development Plan Documents published in 2005<sup>1</sup>. This guidance has since been superseded (in September 2009) by the CLG Plan Making Manual<sup>2</sup>, which continues to refer to guidance on undertaking Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) published in 2005<sup>3</sup>. This SA Report will combine the SEA guidance with the advice within the Plan Making Manual.

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (November 2005) available from:  
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/sustainabilityappraisal>

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

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

- 2.2 An overarching LDF Scoping Report generic to all LDF Development Plan Documents has already been prepared. This was produced during the preparation of the Core Strategy Submission Document and as such the overarching SA of the Council's LDF is the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. This is in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12): Local Spatial Planning, which states that "Sustainability appraisal must be proportionate to the plan in question. It should not repeat the appraisal of higher level policy" (paragraph 4.42).
- 2.3 The Council's Core Strategy was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination (to be undertaken by the independent Inspector on behalf of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government) on 14 January 2010. The final SA Report for the Core Strategy Submission Document with an integrated Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was produced in 2009. However, following the Forest Heath case (*Save Historic Newmarket v. Forest Heath District Council*) in March 2011 which provided an additional interpretation on undertaking SEA, the Council requested that the Inspector delay the issuing of a decision on the soundness of the Core Strategy to enable a review of the Core Strategy Submission SA to be undertaken. The Inspector accepted this request, and an addendum to the submitted Core Strategy SA was produced, and consulted upon in June/July 2011. The addendum appraised in further detail the preferred general locations for housing and employment development and the reasonable alternatives. The addendum should be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy Submission SA.
- 2.4 The Core Strategy was found sound, subject to changes and the Inspector's Report stated that the SA/SEA work undertaken, including the addendum, was adequate.
- 2.5 The SEA Baseline Information Profile for the District, which contains a wealth of environmental, economic and social information, is produced by Essex County Council and updated on an annual basis. This will therefore enable a consistent methodology and approach to all LDF documents, and a wide ranging set of information has been included to ensure the full appraisal of individual documents. The evidence base supporting the development of the Core Strategy has also been drawn upon, as appropriate.
- 2.6 The stages of the SA process are outlined in Table 1 below.

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

| Stage   | Task   |
|---------|--|
| Stage A | SA Scoping Process                                     |
| Stage B | Developing and refining options and assessing effects. |
| Stage C | Preparing the SA Report.                               |
| Stage D | Consulting on the Plan and the SA Report.              |
| Stage E | Monitoring and implementing the Plan.                  |

### **3 Preparation of the Allocations DPD and SA Report**

- 3.1 This SA Scoping Report has been drafted to set the context for the preparation of the SA Report of the Allocations DPD. It should be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report which is the overarching SA document of the Council's LDF. In effect it makes up the second part of the SA scoping process for the Allocations DPD.
- 3.2 Each stage of the Allocations DPD will be the subject of an SA which will be prepared alongside the appropriate document. The milestones for the preparation of the Allocations DPD are set out below:
- Consultation with statutory bodies on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken between 5 March 2009 and 3 April 2009
  - Public consultation on the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation was undertaken between 17 March 2010 and 30 April 2010
  - Pre-Submission Consultation
  - Submission to the Secretary of State
  - Examination in Public
  - Adoption

### **4 Allocations SA Scoping Process**

- 4.1 SA Scoping Methodology is set out in government guidance. Stage A describes 5 main tasks set out in Table 2 below. In the context of scoping the Allocations DPD it is considered a useful exercise to re-examine the previous findings of this stage as set out in the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report.

**Table 2 – Stages of the SA Scoping Study Process**

| <b>Task</b>  | <b>Purpose</b>  |
|--|---|
| A1: Reviewing Relevant Policies, Plans and Programmes                  | To identify other relevant plans, policies, programmes and sustainability objectives, and assess the context provided by them, in particular relevant environmental, social and economic objectives and requirements. |
| A2: Collecting baseline information                                    | To provide the basis to predict and monitor effects and help to identify sustainability problems and alternative ways of dealing with them.   |
| A3: Identifying the sustainability issues and the appraisal objectives | To define key issues for the DPD and develop sustainability plan objectives and options to link to evidence by reference to baseline information.   |

| <b>Task</b>                              | <b>Purpose</b>  |
|--|---|
| A4: Considering options and alternatives | To identify the effects of 'reasonable alternatives' as set out in the SEA Directive, as appropriate. However, there is no need to devise alternatives simply to comply with the Directive.   |
| A5: Developing the SA Framework          | To identify SA Objectives, where possible to be expressed in the form of targets and sustainability indicators. The issues to be covered in the SA Framework and the level of detail should be such that they are relevant and proportionate to the plan. |
| A6: Consultation on Scope of the SA      | Statutory, specific and general stakeholders.   |

4.2 Comments were received and considered on the Scoping Report. The remaining stages of the SA process will then be completed as an integral part of the Allocations DPD preparation.

**Task A1: Reviewing Relevant Plans, Policies and Programmes**

4.3 As the overarching SA for Council's LDF, Appendix IV of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report identifies a number of plans, policies and programmes relevant to the production of the LDF generally. It is not intended to repeat here the documents identified but attention is drawn to the Core Strategy Submission SA Report which provides a thorough review of these.

4.4 Since the production of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report, other evidence base documents have been produced to inform the production of the LDF. Other plans, policies or strategies which will be considered in the appraisal of the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document are as follows:

- Core Strategy Submission Document
- Sustainable Community Strategy 2010-2015
- Affordable Housing Viability Study 2010
- Open Space Study 2009
- Essex and South Suffolk Shoreline Management Plan
- Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2009)
- Affordable Housing Viability Study (2010)
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 & 2 Final Report (February 2011)
- Thames Gateway South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment: Update Report 2010

### **Task A2: Collecting Baseline Information**

- 4.5 The SEA Baseline Information Profile in Appendix III of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report is a report produced by Essex County Council on an annual basis. It provides a plethora of valuable up-to-date information on the social, economic and environmental status of the District. This living document, which forms part of the Council's Evidence Base for the LDF, will therefore be adequate to enable the monitoring of the Allocations DPD once adopted and it will also provide an assessment of the performance and impact of the emerging Allocations policies on the SA Objectives.
- 4.6 The SEA Baseline Information Profile documents can be found on the Council's website at [www.rochford.gov.uk](http://www.rochford.gov.uk).

### **Task A3: Identifying the Sustainability Issues and the Appraisal Objectives**

- 4.7 Essex County Council was commissioned in October 2005 by Rochford District Council to progress the SA work of the Core Strategy DPD. An SA scoping process was undertaken during 2005 to help ensure that the SA covers the key sustainability issues that are relevant to the spatial and development planning system in the Rochford area. This included the development of an SA Framework of objectives (which are detailed within the Core Strategy Submission SA Report) to comprise the basis for appraisal. An SA Scoping Report was prepared to summarise the findings of the scoping process. This was published in November 2005 for consultation with statutory consultees. Responses to this scoping consultation, and how they were taken into account, are reported in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 4.8 Four iterations of the Core Strategy have been developed; the Issues and Options Document (2006), the Preferred Options Document (2007), the Revised Preferred Options Document (2008) and the Submission Document (2009). Each stage has been subject to SA assessing the environmental, economic and social implications of the options/policies considered.
- 4.9 Following the findings of SA work undertaken, consultation responses and other evidence base work, the Core Strategy was significantly revised in 2008 (the Revised Preferred Options Document). The SA Framework (discussed further under Task A5) was revised and statutory consultees were consulted in November 2008.
- 4.10 The key sustainability issues for the District are identified in Table 3.1 of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. It is considered that this list is of relevance to the Allocations DPD. These issues were used in developing the objectives and policies of the document, as detailed below under Task A5.

### **Task A4: Considering Options and Alternatives**

- 4.11 The inclusion of the effects of 'reasonable alternatives' is required by the SEA Directive. 'Reasonable alternatives' should form part of both the SA and the plan, and the guidance notes that within DPDs this will take the form of options. Furthermore it is advised that there is no need to devise alternatives to simply to comply with the SEA Directive. However, the aforementioned Forest Heath case has provided an additional interpretation on undertaking SEA, in that reasons for the rejection of reasonable alternatives should be clearly set out.

- 4.12 The majority of the options for the allocation of land relate to the continued allocation of sites, for example existing employment land, community uses and the Coastal Protection Belt, and the allocation of additional uses such as educational use and leisure facilities. These are predominately, but not exclusively, outside of the Green Belt.
- 4.13 The justification for the different options for the reallocation of Green Belt land, including residential development, additional employment development and Gypsy and Traveller sites, is set out below.
- 4.14 The options for the location of future housing land supply to take place on a small amount of reallocated Green Belt set out in the Discussion and Consultation Document relate to the general locations identified in Policy H2 (Extensions to residential envelopes and phasing) and Policy H3 (Extension to residential envelopes post-2021) of the Core Strategy Submission Document. The options identified are variations of potential sites, of which the SA has evaluated the different issues and potential effects of these.
- 4.15 Similarly the options for future employment land to be identified on a small amount of reallocated Green Belt have been developed from the general locations identified in Policy ED4 (Future Employment Allocations) of the Core Strategy Submission Document.
- 4.16 Most of the options identified for the potential allocation of a Gypsy and Traveller site(s) in the District relate to the spatial location stipulated in Policy H7 (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation) of the Core Strategy Submission Document i.e. to the west of the District. The majority of the options set out in the Discussion and Consultation Document, with the exception of Options GT3, GT6 and GT7, have emerged as potential Gypsy and Traveller sites through the 'call for sites' exercise undertaken by the Council. Option GT3 is a potential site which has been identified given its potential to fulfill the criteria set out in the Core Strategy Submission Document; it is well related to main settlement of Rayleigh and the highway network to the west of the District. Options GT6 and GT7 were submitted during the 'call for sites' exercise, but for employment uses and accommodation for travelling show people, respectively.
- 4.17 The different options set out in the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document are further discussed with Task B2.

#### **Task A5: Developing the SA Framework**

- 4.18 The Local Planning Authority does not anticipate that additional sustainability objectives, beyond those set out in the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report need to be added to adequately test the sustainability impacts of the Allocations DPD.
- 4.19 Several stages of scoping and consultation on the sustainability issues and objectives and the SA Framework have informed the preparation of the overarching Core Strategy SA Report as discussed below:

- 4.20 The key sustainability issues were identified through the SA scoping process, and Rochford District Council invited statutory consultees to comment on these in November 2005.
- 4.21 The Core Strategy Issues and Options Document was initially prepared in spring/summer 2006 and was then published for consultation in September 2006. The SA and the comments received during the consultation helped to determine the preferred overall spatial strategy, and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Document was published for public consultation in May 2007. A number of the comments received from the consultation expressed a desire to see greater detail in the Core Strategy DPD. However, the issue that elicited the most responses related to the location and amount of new housing. As a result of these concerns the Council resolved to revise the Core Strategy Preferred Options Document. This document was prepared and published for consultation in November 2008.
- 4.22 A revised SA framework was sent out to statutory consultees (Natural England, English Heritage and Environment Agency) in September 2008. Comments received as a result of this consultation were reviewed and changes made where possible and relevant; responses are summarised and reported in Appendix II of the Core Strategy SA Report.
- 4.23 The Core Strategy Preferred Options SA Report was published for public consultation alongside the revised Core Strategy Preferred Options Document in November 2008. Comments received on the SA were considered and, where appropriate, were addressed in the Submission report and appendices. Appendix II of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report provides a summary of comments received and responses to those comments.
- 4.24 The Core Strategy Submission SA Report was published alongside the Core Strategy Submission Document, in accordance with SEA Regulations and SA guidance. It has been published on the Council's website [www.rochford.gov.uk](http://www.rochford.gov.uk) and sent to statutory consultees and other relevant stakeholders.
- 4.25 It is important to note that SEA as required by the European SEA Directive 2001/42/EC and as transposed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, has been formally integrated into the SA of the Allocations DPD. The SEA requirement as aforementioned has been embedded within the SA of the Core Strategy Submission Document, and has been used to inform the preparation of the Allocations SA Report. As stated in Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12): Local Spatial Planning, "Sustainability appraisal must be proportionate to the plan in question. It should not repeat the appraisal of higher level policy" (paragraph 4.42). Therefore as a higher level policy document, the SA/SEA of the Core Strategy Submission Document should be referred to as appropriate.
- 4.26 The final SA Framework used to appraise the development of the Core Strategy DPD is set out in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.

**Task A6: Consultation on Scope of the Allocations DPD SA**

- 4.27 Even though consultation has taken place on the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report and throughout the development of the Core Strategy DPD and the SA Report it is considered appropriate, in order to satisfy the SEA Directive, it is necessary to consult again at this stage in the preparation of the Allocations SA Report.
- 4.28 The decision-aiding questions of the SA Framework were adapted from that of the Core Strategy Submission Document to reflect the differing perspectives and scales of the Development Plan Document, where appropriate (Table 3).

**Table 3: Draft SA Framework**

|   | <b>SA Objective</b>   | <b>Decision-Aiding Question<br/>Will it (the Policy)...?</b>   |
|---|---|--|
|   | <b>Balanced Communities</b>   |  |
| 1 | To ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the phasing of infrastructure, including community facilities to meet ongoing and future needs?</li> <li>● Will it ensure the regeneration and enhancement of existing rural and urban communities?</li> <li>● Will it ensure equal opportunities and that all sections of the community are catered for?</li> <li>● Will it meet the needs of an ageing population?</li> <li>● Will the policies and options proposed seek to enhance the qualifications and skills of the local community?</li> <li>● Will income and quality-of-life disparities be reduced?</li> </ul> |
|   | <b>Healthy &amp; Safe Communities</b>   |  |
| 2 | Create healthy and safe environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the delivery of high quality, safe and inclusive design?</li> <li>● Will it improve health and reduce health inequalities?</li> <li>● Will it promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles?</li> <li>● Will green infrastructure and networks be promoted and/or enhanced?</li> <li>● Will it minimise noise pollution?</li> <li>● Will it minimise light pollution?</li> </ul>  |

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document – Sustainability Appraisal**

|                                 | <b>SA Objective</b>  | <b>Decision-Aiding Question<br/>Will it (the Policy)...?</b>   |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Housing</b>                  |  |  |
| 3                               | To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?</li> <li>● Will a mix of housing types and tenures be promoted?</li> <li>● Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?</li> <li>● Does it promote high quality design?</li> <li>● Is there sustainable access to key services?</li> <li>● Does it meet the resident's needs in terms of sheltered and lifetime homes or those that can be easily adapted so?</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Economy &amp; Employment</b> |  |  |
| 4                               | To achieve sustainable levels of economic growth/prosperity and promote town centre vitality/viability   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does it promote and enhance existing centres by focusing development in such centres?</li> <li>● Will it improve business development?</li> <li>● Does it enhance consumer choice through the provision of a range of shopping, leisure, and local services to meet the needs of the entire community?</li> <li>● Does it promote mixed use and high density development in urban centres?</li> <li>● Does it promote a wide variety of jobs across all sectors?</li> <li>● Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District?</li> <li>● Will it aid the realisation of London Southend Airport's economic potential?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Accessibility</b>            |  |  |
| 5                               | To promote more sustainable transport choices both for people and moving freight ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it increase the availability of sustainable transport modes?</li> <li>● Will it seek to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation other than the private car, including walking and cycling?</li> <li>● Will it contribute positively to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services?</li> </ul>   |

|                                  | <b>SA Objective</b>  | <b>Decision-Aiding Question<br/>Will it (the Policy)...?</b>  |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
|                                  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</li> <li>• Does it seek to encourage development where large volumes of people and/or transport movements are located in sustainable accessible locations?</li> <li>• Does it enable access for all sections of the community, including the young, the socially deprived, those with disabilities and the elderly?</li> <li>• Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District, and for out-commuting to be reduced?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Biodiversity</b>              |  |   |
| 6                                | To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi natural habitats, including the District’s distinctive estuaries and salt marshes?</li> <li>• Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to protected species and priority species?</li> <li>• Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?</li> <li>• Will it conserve and enhance sites of geological significance?</li> <li>• Does land use allocation reflect the scope of using brownfield land for significant wildlife interest where viable and realistic?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Cultural Heritage</b>         |  |   |
| 7                                | To maintain and enhance the cultural heritage and assets of the District   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?</li> <li>• Will it support locally-based cultural resources and activities?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Landscape &amp; Townscape</b> |  |   |
| 8                                | To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it seek to enhance the range and quality of the public realm and open spaces?</li> <li>• Will it contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?</li> </ul>   |

|                                    | <b>SA Objective</b>   | <b>Decision-Aiding Question<br/>Will it (the Policy)...?</b>  |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it preserve and/or improve the quality of the landscape?</li> <li>• Will it preserve and/or enhance townscape character and value?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Climate Change &amp; Energy</b> |   |   |
| 9                                  | To reduce contributions to climate change                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption?</li> <li>• Will it lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources?</li> <li>• Does it adapt to and provide for the consequences of climate change in a largely low-lying area?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Water</b>                       |   |   |
| 10                                 | To improve water quality and reduce the risk of flooding            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it improve the quality of inland water?</li> <li>• Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?</li> <li>• Will it provide for an efficient water conservation and supply regime?</li> <li>• Will it provide for effective wastewater treatment?</li> <li>• Will it require the provision of sustainable drainage systems in new development?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the risk of flooding and promote sustainable flood management?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Land &amp; Soil</b>             |   |   |
| 11                                 | To maintain and improve the quality of the District's land and soil | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it ensure the re-use of previously-developed land and urban areas in preference to Greenfield sites, as far as is practicable given the characteristics of the District?</li> <li>• Will higher-density development be promoted where appropriate?</li> <li>• Will soil quality be preserved?</li> <li>• Will it promote the remediation of contaminated land?</li> <li>• Will the best and most versatile agricultural land be protected?</li> </ul> |

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document – Sustainability Appraisal**

|    | <b>SA Objective</b>                            | <b>Decision-Aiding Question<br/>Will it (the Policy)...?</b>   |
|----|--|--|
|    | <b>Air Quality</b>                             |  |
| 12 | To improve air quality                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will air quality be improved through reduced emissions (e.g. through reducing car travel)?</li> <li>● Will it direct transport movements away from AQMAs and/or potentially significant junctions?</li> </ul>   |
|    | <b>Sustainable Design &amp; Construction</b>   |  |
| 13 | To promote sustainable design and construction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the use of sustainable design principles, e.g. encouraging a mix of uses?</li> <li>● Will climate proofing design measures be incorporated?</li> <li>● Will the local character/vernacular be preserved and enhanced through development?</li> <li>● Will it require the re-use and recycling of construction materials?</li> <li>● Will it encourage locally-sourced materials?</li> <li>● Will it require best-practice sustainable construction methods, for example in energy and water efficiency?</li> </ul> |

4.29 Three statutory consultees (Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency) were consulted on the draft SA Framework for the Allocations DPD between 5 March 2009 and 3 April 2009.

4.30 Responses were received from Natural England, which have been taken into account and a revised SA Framework has subsequently been produced. The issues raised by Natural England are set out in Table 4 below.

**Table 4 – Comments received from Natural England**

| <b>SA Objective</b>          | <b>Comments</b>  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Healthy and safe communities | Natural England supports the inclusion of a criteria relating to access to green infrastructure assets. If possible the appraisal should make clear what constitutes green infrastructure, and acknowledge that there are increasingly apparent linkages between access to quality green spaces and habitats with improved physical and mental health. |

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document – Sustainability Appraisal**

| SA Objective                        | Comments   |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Accessibility                       | Natural England welcomes the addition of walking and cycling to these criteria. The design and layout of new development and the pro-active and integrated management of green infrastructure networks can greatly enhance the accessibility (and attractiveness) to walking and cycling. Criteria might also be utilised which examines the accessibility to green infrastructure and the 'natural environment' to all sections of the plan area community.   |
| Biodiversity                        | The profile of biodiversity within the criteria is welcomed, and the inclusion of reference to locally distinctive assets is welcomed (estuarine environments) as is reference to biodiversity value of brownfield sites. Both strengthen the local specificity of the overall process. However Natural England sees there is potential to further enhance the appraisal's biodiversity credentials. In particular it should make reference to the practice of 'biodiversity by design'. In other words, does new development integrate within it opportunities for new habitat creation, particularly where they could facilitate species movement and colonisation in relation to climate change pressures on biodiversity and its distribution? |
| Landscape                           | The general thrust of the decision-aiding criteria in this objective is supported. Natural England supports enhanced recognition of the importance of local landscapes to local communities, and the importance this has in strengthening sense of place and local distinctiveness. It also considers it important to recognise character rather than quality which is a more subjective approach. Most counties and districts have in place landscape character assessments. Therefore, criteria 4 which states 'preserve and/or improve the quality of the landscape', should be altered to relate to 'will it conserve (as preservation is neither realistic or desirable) the landscape character areas of the plan area?'                     |
| Climate and energy                  | The second bullet is welcomed, but could be expanded to facilitate the need for enhanced habitat connectivity and landscape permeability for species movement in the light of climate change.  |
| Water                               | The final new bullet could be expanded to acknowledge the need for integrated sustainable flood management which works with natural processes, presents habitat enhancement opportunities and is landscape character sensitive.  |
| Sustainable design and construction | This addition to the appraisal process is welcomed by Natural England, particularly in respect to the need to protect and conserve vernacular design whilst adopting more environmentally friendly construction methods. However a further enhancement could be made in respect of designing in biodiversity (see above). Buildings and places, particularly larger developments (although all buildings have the potential) for biodiversity friendly design to be integrated in through either building design (such as nesting openings in buildings or bat roosts within structures such as bridges) or through appropriate landscaping and masterplanning of larger sites (through management, habitat mix and indigenous planting).          |

4.31 The revised SA Framework used to appraise the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document is shown in Table 5 below. Where the SA Framework has been amended according to consultation responses, additional text is highlighted in green and omitted text has a strikethrough.

**Table 5 – Revised SA Framework**

|                                       | <b>SA Objective</b>  | <b>Decision-Aiding Question<br/>Will it (the Policy)...?</b>   |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Balanced Communities</b>           |  |  |
| 1                                     | To ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the phasing of infrastructure, including community facilities to meet ongoing and future needs?</li> <li>● Will it ensure the regeneration and enhancement of existing rural and urban communities?</li> <li>● Will it ensure equal opportunities and that all sections of the community are catered for?</li> <li>● Will it meet the needs of an ageing population?</li> <li>● Will the policies and options proposed seek to enhance the qualifications and skills of the local community?</li> <li>● Will income and quality-of-life disparities be reduced?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Healthy &amp; Safe Communities</b> |  |  |
| 2                                     | Create <b>healthy and</b> safe environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the delivery of high quality, safe and inclusive design?</li> <li>● Will it improve health and reduce health inequalities?</li> <li>● Will it promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles?</li> <li>● Will green infrastructure (<b>non-vehicular infrastructure routes and links</b>) and networks be promoted and/or enhanced?</li> <li>● Will it minimise noise pollution?</li> <li>● Will it minimise light pollution?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Housing</b>                        |  |  |
| 3                                     | To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?</li> <li>● Will a mix of housing types and tenures be promoted?</li> <li>● Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?</li> </ul>  |

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document – Sustainability Appraisal**

|                                 | <b>SA Objective</b>  | <b>Decision-Aiding Question<br/>Will it (the Policy)...?</b>   |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
|                                 |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it promote high quality design?</li> <li>• Is there sustainable access to key services?</li> <li>• Does it meet the resident’s needs in terms of sheltered and lifetime homes or those that can be easily adapted so?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Economy &amp; Employment</b> |  |  |
| 4                               | To achieve sustainable levels of economic growth/prosperity and promote town centre vitality/viability   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it promote and enhance existing centres by focusing development in such centres?</li> <li>• Will it improve business development?</li> <li>• Does it enhance consumer choice through the provision of a range of shopping, leisure, and local services to meet the needs of the entire community?</li> <li>• Does it promote mixed use and high density development in urban centres?</li> <li>• Does it promote a wide variety of jobs across all sectors?</li> <li>• Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District?</li> <li>• Will it aid the realisation of London Southend Airport’s economic potential?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Accessibility</b>            |  |  |
| 5                               | To promote more sustainable transport choices both for people and moving freight ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase the availability of sustainable transport modes?</li> <li>• Will it seek to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation other than the private car, including walking and cycling?</li> <li>• Will it contribute positively to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</li> <li>• Does it seek to encourage development where large volumes of people and/or transport movements are located in sustainable accessible locations?</li> </ul>  |

|                                  | <b>SA Objective</b>  | <b>Decision-Aiding Question<br/>Will it (the Policy)...?</b>   |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
|                                  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it enable access for all sections of the community, including the young, the socially deprived, those with disabilities and the elderly?</li> <li>Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District, and for out-commuting to be reduced?</li> <li>Does it enable access to green infrastructure and the wider natural environment to all sections of the community?</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Biodiversity</b>              |  |  |
| 6                                | To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi natural habitats, including the District's distinctive estuaries and salt marshes?</li> <li>Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to protected species and priority species?</li> <li>Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?</li> <li>Will it conserve and enhance sites of geological significance?</li> <li>Does land use allocation reflect the scope of using brownfield land for significant wildlife interest where viable and realistic?</li> <li>Does new development integrate within it opportunities for new habitat creation, particularly where they could facilitate species movement and colonisation in relation to climate change pressures on biodiversity and its distribution?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Cultural Heritage</b>         |  |  |
| 7                                | To maintain and enhance the cultural heritage and assets of the District   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?</li> <li>Will it support locally-based cultural resources and activities?</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Landscape &amp; Townscape</b> |  |  |
| 8                                | To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it seek to enhance the range and quality of the public realm and open spaces?</li> <li>Will it contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe?</li> </ul>   |

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document – Sustainability Appraisal**

|                                    | SA Objective  | Decision-Aiding Question<br>Will it (the Policy)...?  |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?</li> <li><del>Will it preserve and/or improve the quality of the landscape?</del></li> <li>Will it conserve (as preservation is neither realistic or desirable) the landscape character areas of the plan area?</li> <li>Will it preserve and/or enhance townscape character and value?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Climate Change &amp; Energy</b> |   |   |
| 9                                  | To reduce contributions to climate change                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption?</li> <li>Will it lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources?</li> <li>Does it adapt to and provide for the consequences of climate change in a largely low-lying area?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Water</b>                       |   |   |
| 10                                 | To improve water quality and reduce the risk of flooding            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it improve the quality of inland water?</li> <li>Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?</li> <li>Will it provide for an efficient water conservation and supply regime?</li> <li>Will it provide for effective wastewater treatment?</li> <li>Will it require the provision of sustainable drainage systems in new development?</li> <li><del>Will it reduce the risk of flooding and promote sustainable flood management?</del></li> <li>Will it reduce the risk of flooding?</li> <li>Will it integrate sustainable flood management which works with natural processes, presents habitat enhancement opportunities and is landscape character sensitive?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Land &amp; Soil</b>             |   |   |
| 11                                 | To maintain and improve the quality of the District's land and soil | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it ensure the re-use of previously-developed land and urban areas in preference to Greenfield sites, as far as is practicable given the characteristics of the District?</li> <li>Will higher-density development be promoted where appropriate?</li> </ul>   |

|    | <b>SA Objective</b>                            | <b>Decision-Aiding Question<br/>Will it (the Policy)...?</b>   |
|----|--|--|
|    |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will soil quality be preserved?</li> <li>• Will it promote the remediation of contaminated land?</li> <li>• Will the best and most versatile agricultural land be protected?</li> </ul>   |
|    | <b>Air Quality</b>                             |  |
| 12 | To improve air quality                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will air quality be improved through reduced emissions (e.g. through reducing car travel)?</li> <li>• Will it direct transport movements away from AQMAs and/or potentially significant junctions?</li> </ul>   |
|    | <b>Sustainable Design &amp; Construction</b>   |  |
| 13 | To promote sustainable design and construction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it ensure the use of sustainable design principles, e.g. encouraging a mix of uses?</li> <li>• Will climate proofing design measures be incorporated?</li> <li>• Will the local character/vernacular be preserved and enhanced through development?</li> <li>• Will it require the re-use and recycling of construction materials?</li> <li>• Will it encourage locally-sourced materials?</li> <li>• Will it require best-practice sustainable construction methods, for example in energy and water efficiency?</li> </ul> |

## **5 Developing and Refining Options and Assessing Effects**

- 5.1 The discussion and consultation stage (Regulation 25) in the development of the Allocations DPD specifies potential site allocation options for the general locations for the reallocation of Green Belt land, Gypsy and Traveller allocations, existing and proposed employment land, environment allocations, community facility allocations and options for the town centre and shopping area boundary having regard to proposals and areas identified in the Core Strategy Submission Document. As such the Allocations DPD must be in conformity with the Core Strategy and must be read in conjunction with it.
- 5.2 The second stage in the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal is Stage B which encompasses the development and refinement of options and assessment of effects. The six main tasks are set out in Table 6 below.

**Table 6 – Stage B Tasks following the Scoping Process**

| Stage | Task   |
|-------|--|
| B1    | Testing the DPD objectives against the SA framework                              |
| B2    | Developing the DPD options   |
| B3    | Predicting the effects of the DPD  |
| B4    | Evaluating the effects of the DPD  |
| B5    | Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects |
| B6    | Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD    |

**Task B1: Testing the DPD Objectives Against the SA Framework**

5.3 The vision and objectives for the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document are consistent with those set out in the Core Strategy Submission Document. The vision and objectives of the Core Strategy Submission Document have been tested against the SA objectives to identify both potential synergies and inconsistencies. This assessment can be found in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report (see paragraphs 5.6-5.8 and Appendix V).

**Task B2: Developing the DPD Options**

5.4 **Residential Allocations** – The identification of the general locations for proposed residential development have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal throughout the development of the Core Strategy.

5.5 The Core Strategy Submission Sustainability Appraisal recognises that “The actual locations for growth proposed in the policy are considered to be the most sustainable options available, within the context of the overall high levels of population growth being proposed in the East of England Plan” (paragraph 5.17). Thus the general locations identified are considered to be the most sustainable options for future development in the District given the alternatives. The decision-making process has been further strengthened following the review of the Core Strategy Submission Sustainability Appraisal in light of the judgment in the Forest Heath case. The Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2011 clarifies that the proposed general locations for residential development are the most sustainable when compared to the reasonable alternatives.

5.6 Accordingly the options for the reallocation of Green Belt land identified in the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document correspond to the general locations identified in the Core Strategy Submission Document. Other potential sites, which have been submitted as part of the Council’s ‘Call for Sites’ exercise (between January 2007 – April 2009) have been included in ‘Appendix 1: Site Assessments’ of the Allocations DPD and have not been included and appraised as they do not conform to the Core Strategy.

- 5.7 The Core Strategy Submission Sustainability Appraisal recognises that the identified areas of employment land for reallocation as residential may “generate significant positive effects through re-allocating unviable brownfield land for housing” (paragraph 5.37). The Allocations DPD subsequently identifies the existing employment land to be reallocated for residential development in accordance with the Core Strategy Submission Document. These are Rawreth Industrial Estate, Stambridge Mills and Star Lane Industrial Estate and Star Lane Brickworks (these are combined as Star Lane Industrial Estate in the Core Strategy).
- 5.8 **Gypsy and Traveller Allocations** – The Council is required to allocate 15 Gypsy and Traveller sites by 2018 as detailed in the Core Strategy. There are few unauthorised Gypsy and Traveller sites in the District and a limited number of potential sites were put forward to the Council during the ‘Call for Sites’ exercise to be considered during the preparation of this stage of the Allocations DPD (the two points together indicating a lack of demand for such sites in the District). As such the options consider and assessed include existing unauthorised sites, extensions to unauthorised sites as appropriate, sites put forward as part of the ‘Call for Sites’ exercise and a new option on greenfield land which relates well to new residential development and the Core Strategy as a whole.
- 5.9 **Employment Allocations** – Other existing employment land which is not identified to be reallocated for residential development in the Core Strategy Submission Document have been included as options to be designated for employment land. The Core Strategy Submission Sustainability Appraisal recognises that protecting these locations from residential development would have a positive benefit through “ensuring existing locations are better supported and offering the possibility that such locations may be able to coordinate either individually or collectively effective travel that would be more sustainable” (paragraph 5.37).
- 5.10 To compensate for the reallocation of existing employment land, as identified in the Core Strategy, additional employment land will be allocated to the west of Rayleigh, north of London Southend Airport and south of Great Wakering. A range of potential options are identified in the Allocations DPD which correspond to these general locations, although it is noted that the allocation of land to the north of London Southend Airport will be determined through the emerging London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan, and as such will be subject to an independent Sustainability Appraisal.
- 5.11 **Environment Allocations** – The Local Wildlife Sites have been identified through the Local Wildlife Sites Review 2007 which forms part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework. Their formal adoption through the allocations process would formalise their local importance and protection through the planning system. The Core Strategy seeks to safeguard these sites. The Upper Roach Valley is recognised as an important green open space, which the Core Strategy seeks to protect. As such, this area has been identified in the Allocations DPD for allocation in its own right. The Coastal Protection Belt, as recognised in the Core Strategy Submission Document is an important natural designation for nature conservation and amenity reasons which has subsequently been identified as an option for allocation.

- 5.12 **Community Facilities Allocations** – The general locations identified for new primary schools for west Rayleigh and west Rochford correspond with the general locations identified for residential development and where additional educational facilities would be required to support this in the Core Strategy. In addition to two new primary schools, the Core Strategy Submission Document recognises the need for additional land for the expansion for King Edmund School, and the Allocations DPD identifies several potential options for this. There are options to designate existing educational, leisure and community facilities to safeguard their future and existing areas of public open space which the Core Strategy seeks to protect. A range of options for the allocation of the different community facilities has therefore been included in the Discussion and Consultation Document.
- 5.13 **Town Centre and Shopping Frontage Allocations** – Local Development Documents are required to define the primary shopping area in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth). The Allocations DPD sets out a range of options for the allocation of a primary shopping area for each of the District’s town centres. It also provides numerous options for the designation of the town centre boundaries to ensure their future vitality and vibrancy. Additionally an option is included to de-allocate Hockley as a town centre which has taken into account the Retail and Leisure Study 2008 and community feedback from the initial consultation on the Hockley Area Action Plan (the Issues and Options Document).
- 5.14 **Additional Alternative Options** – In addition to the range of options identified in the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document, which conform to the Core Strategy, Submission Document, a number of additional alternative site options have been identified, primarily for residential allocation but also one for Gypsy and Traveller allocation, and one for employment allocation. These were identified through comments received during the public consultation.
- 5.15 Each option included within the Discussion and Consultation Document and the identified additional alternative options have been appraised against the SA Framework, where appropriate.
- 5.16 A brief and more detailed summary of the assessment can be found in section 6.

### **Task B3: Predicting the effects of the DPD**

- 5.17 The strategic sites identified in the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document have been subject to assessment in order to determine their performance in sustainability terms, with reference to social, environmental and economic factors.
- 5.18 The SA Objective for every option corresponding to the general locations identified in the Core Strategy Submission Document has been appraised according to the decision-aiding questions for the SA Objectives set out in Table 5. The SEA Baseline Information Profile has been used to inform the SA, where appropriate.

#### **Task B4: Evaluating the effects of the DPD**

- 5.19 Commentary has been provided to further clarify predicted effects of potential options and effects have been evaluated as appropriate.
- 5.20 Where indirect impacts are identified these are also included in the matrices.
- 5.21 These matrices are presented in Appendix 1-6.

#### **Task B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects**

- 5.22 At this discussion and consultation stage of the Allocations DPD, the sustainability effects of the different options have been assessed comparatively against one another to identify the most sustainable option.
- 5.23 Potential mitigation measures to offset adverse effects and opportunities to enhance options have been explored at this stage, and initial recommendations have been included as appropriate, for example the inclusion of a wildlife corridor and need to accommodate non-vulnerable uses within areas at risk of flooding, in order to inform the development of the next stage of the document (the Pre-Submission Document).
- 5.24 Strategic mitigation measures and recommendations for the Core Strategy Submission Document, which the Allocations DPD must conform to, are detailed within the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.

#### **Task B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD**

- 5.25 At this discussion and consultation stage of the Allocations DPD, measures to monitor the significant effects of its implementation have not been included. Strategic measures to monitor the implementation of the Core Strategy Submission Document, which the Allocations DPD must conform to, are detailed within the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. Where appropriate, measures to monitor the significant effects of the Allocations DPD will be addressed in subsequent iterations of SA.

## **6 Sustainability Appraisal – Matrices and Summaries**

- 6.1 The following section provides a summary of the detailed assessment of the preferred and alternative options against the SA objectives. Matrices in Appendices to the document set out the detailed assessment themselves of preferred and alternative options against the SA objectives and accompanying decision-aiding questions.
- 6.2 To aid interpretation of these, the table below identifies the range of reasonable options in the Allocations DPD in respect of residential options, and pulls together a summary of the recommendations/key observations identified through the SA process, and set out in greater detail in following the table.

**Table 7 – Alternative Options set out in the Allocations DPD:  
Discussion and Consultation Document and Recommendations/Key Observations following Sustainability Appraisal**

| Options Considered and Appraised:<br>Published Reports and Public Consultation   | Recommendations/Key Observations   |
|--|--|
| <b>Residential Options</b>   |  |
| <p><b>North of London Road</b></p> <p>Five options for the allocation of 550 dwellings considered: Option NLR1, Option NLR2, Option NLR3, Option NLR4 and Option NLR5.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option NLR5 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives and would enable to development of a public transport link between Rawreth Lane and London Road.</li> <li>2. The impact of areas at risk of flooding on the siting of residential development would need to be carefully considered, but residential development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.</li> <li>3. The existing playing field to the south of the site is an established community facility which should be retained.</li> </ol>   |
| <p><b>West Rochford</b></p> <p>Options for the allocation of 600 dwellings considered: Option WR1, Option WR2, Option WR3, Option WR4, Option ALT2 and Option ALT3.</p>    | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option WR1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</li> <li>2. The impact of flood risk areas would need to be carefully considered, but development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.</li> <li>3. The design of any development coming forward would need to be carefully considered within the context of the Conservation Area.</li> <li>4. Option ALT2 performs well against the sustainability objectives, but would not be able to accommodate the full housing requirements for the general location of 'West Rochford', which may lead to fragmented development.</li> <li>5. Option ALT3 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives.</li> </ol> |

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document – Sustainability Appraisal**

| Options Considered and Appraised:<br>Published Reports and Public Consultation  | Recommendations/Key Observations   |
|---|--|
| <b>Residential Options</b>  |  |
| <p><b>West Hockley</b></p> <p>Options for the allocation of 50 dwellings considered:<br/>Option WH1, Option WH2, Option WH3, Option WH4, Option WH5 and Option ALT4</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option WH2 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives. Option WH5 performs well, with the exception of including some greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available.</li> <li>2. Option ALT4 generally performs well against the sustainability objectives compared to other West Hockley alternatives, with the exception that it promotes the development of greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available in the general location of 'West Hockley'.</li> </ol>  |
| <p><b>South Hawkwell</b></p> <p>Options for the allocation of 175 dwellings considered:<br/>Option SH1, Option SH2, Option SH3, Option SH4 and Option ALT7</p>          | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option SH2 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options for 'South Hawkwell'.</li> <li>2. The impact of flood risk areas would need to be carefully considered, but development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.</li> <li>3. Option ALT7 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives, but has the potential to lead to fragmented development, creating an island of residential development within the Green Belt. In addition, it is not well-related to existing designated residential development.</li> </ol> |
| <p><b>East Ashingdon</b></p> <p>Three options for the allocation of 100 dwellings considered:<br/>Option EA1, Option EA2 and Option EA3.</p>                            | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EA1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options for this general location.</li> <li>2. Access to King Edmund School can be provided within Options EA1 and EA3.</li> <li>3. The provision of the list of requirements set out in the Core Strategy Submission Document could take the form of offsite financial contributions for new facilities within the vicinity.</li> </ol>   |

| Options Considered and Appraised:<br>Published Reports and Public Consultation   | Recommendations/Key Observations  |
|--|---|
| <b>Residential Options</b>   |   |
| <p><b>South West Hullbridge</b></p> <p>Options for the allocation of 500 dwellings considered:<br/>Option SWH1, Option SWH2, Option SWH3, Option SWH4, and Option ALT1</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option SWH2 performs well against the sustainability objectives, but Option SWH1 performs even stronger.</li> <li>2. Options SWH1 and SWH2 are well related to the existing residential area and the local services and facilities situated within the village centre along Ferry Road.</li> <li>3. Option SWH2 may have a greater impact on landscape character than Option SWH1 in terms its projection further to the west, which would potentially have a greater visual impact in the locality from the roads to the south.</li> <li>4. Pedestrian links to the east should be provided between the option taken forward and existing residential development rather than road connections to prevent an overburden on the village's existing highway network.</li> <li>5. Although Option ALT1 is previously developed land, it does not perform well against the sustainability objectives. This option would project into the Green Belt, create fragmented development and potentially undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this location.</li> </ol> |

| Options Considered and Appraised:<br>Published Reports and Public Consultation   | Recommendations/Key Observations  |
|--|---|
| <b>Residential Options</b>   |   |
| <p><b>South Canewdon</b></p> <p>Options for the allocation of 60 dwellings considered: Option SC1, Option SC2, Option SC3, Option SC4, Option ALT5 and Option ALT6</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Options SC1, SC2 and SC3 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives as opposed to Option SC4.</li> <li>2. Options SC1 and SC2 could accommodate the housing requirements for this general location but would extend the designated residential area further to the south and west respectively.</li> <li>3. Option SC3 is well related to the existing residential area and could accommodate the housing requirements for this general location, but proposes two segregated sites.</li> <li>4. If Option SC3 is taken forward it should be amended to exclude the small site to the west of the road leading to St Nicholas Church to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained, and if possible extended northwards towards St Nicholas Church.</li> <li>5. Careful consideration would need to be given to the design of any development if Option SC3 is taken forward given its proximity to the Canewdon Church Conservation Area which also encompasses a Grade II* Listed Building (particularly if the option is extended northwards).</li> <li>6. Option ALT5 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives.</li> <li>7. Option ALT6 performs well against the sustainability objectives. However, any development on this site would either have to be at a high density or additional land would be required to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy Submission Document. This has the potential to lead to fragmented development with limited opportunities for providing additional infrastructure.</li> </ol> |

| Options Considered and Appraised:<br>Published Reports and Public Consultation  | Recommendations/Key Observations   |
|---|--|
| <b>Residential Options</b>  |  |
| <p><b>South East Ashingdon</b></p> <p>Three options for the allocation of 500 dwellings considered:<br/>Option SEA1, Option SEA2 and Option SEA3.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option SEA1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options for this general location of 'South East Ashingdon'.</li> <li>2. Option SEA1 has the potential to provide more equal and sustainable access to local services and facilities, and would be able to create a more defensible Green Belt boundary compared to the other options.</li> </ol> |

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

- 6.3 A detailed summary of the findings following the appraisal of the options, and recommendations/key observations for the next iteration of the Allocations DPD, are set out below.

### **Residential Options**

#### **North of London Road**

- 6.4 All of the options in the general location to the 'North of London Road' would have a positive impact on ensuring that everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home through providing a range of housing types, tenure and affordability to meet local needs. Dwellings built to the lifetime homes standard can also be provided.
- 6.5 Option NLR5 would have less of an impact on the landscape character of the area as opposed to the other options for this general location as it does not extend as far west from the existing residential development of Rayleigh. It would ensure greater accessibility than Option NLR2 in particular and it would also enable the provision of a public transport link between Rawreth Lane and London Road, connecting this area to the west of Rayleigh with the town centre. This public transport link would enhance the sustainability and accessibility of communities and services in this area.
- 6.6 Cohesive development in this general location, however, would depend upon the reallocation and redevelopment of Rawreth Industrial Estate which is situated to the east of most of the options, with the exception of Option NLR3, for residential use.
- 6.7 The area at risk of flooding in this general location impacts on the capacity of some of the options to accommodate the infrastructure to support development, in particular Option NLR2. Any areas at risk of flooding must accommodate public open space (which is water-compatible development in accordance with national planning guidance). The inclusion of public open space would have a negative impact on community cohesion if Option NLR2 was brought forward for development through severing the developable area of the site. Nevertheless a range of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) are available to manage excess surface water in the area.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option NLR5 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives and would enable the development of a public transport link between Rawreth Lane and London Road.
- (2) The impact of areas at risk of flooding on the siting of residential development would need to be carefully considered, but residential development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.
- (3) The existing playing field to the south of the site is an established community facility which should be retained.

#### **West Rochford**

- 6.8 All of the options in the general location of 'West Rochford' would have a positive impact on ensuring that everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home through providing a range of housing types, tenure and affordability to meet local needs. Dwellings built to the lifetime homes standard can also be provided.

- 6.9 Whilst development in this general location would be well related to the town centre in terms of access to services and facilities, the provision of a public transport link along Hall Road is constrained due to the configuration of the railway bridge by the West Street/Ashingdon Road/Hall Road roundabout. Options WR1 and WR3 are well related to the existing residential development to the north of Hall Road and would ensure the greatest access to services and facilities in the town centre and existing public transport routes (a bus route runs along West Street and Ashingdon Road, and Rochford train station is situated at the eastern end of Hall Road).
- 6.10 Option WR1 would ensure the least projection to the west along Hall Road and would have less of an impact on landscape character. The other options for this general location would extend the developed area along Hall Road, with the potential to coalesce with ribbon development to the west, particularly Option WR4. Options WR1 and WR3 would have a greater positive impact on community cohesion as opposed to the other options.
- 6.11 An important consideration in this general location is the historic environment. Development would not have a negative impact on the setting of the Rochford Conservation Area *per se*, as this would depend on the design of any development coming forward. Design will be managed through the development management process. In terms of avoiding further suburbanisation of Hall Road, Option WR1 would have less of an impact than other options, given that much of the area to the south of this site has already been developed. Although Option WR2 is situated the furthest from the Conservation Area and would subsequently have the least impact, this option is the one of the least sustainable options (in conjunction with Option WR4) as it would adjoin ribbon development to the west of Hall Road, provide poor access to services and facilities situated in Rochford town centre, and undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this area.
- 6.12 Options WR2 and WR4 are not situated within an area at risk of flooding, however, the north eastern corner of Options WR1 and WR3 are within an area at risk. This area should be designated as public open space which is water-compatible development in accordance with national planning guidance. Furthermore a range of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) are available to manage excess surface water.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option WR1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The impact of flood risk areas would need to be carefully considered, but development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.
- (3) The design of any development coming forward would need to be carefully considered within the context of the Conservation Area.

#### **West Hockley**

- 6.13 All of the options in the general location of 'West Hockley' would have a positive impact on ensuring that everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home through providing a range of housing types, tenure and affordability to meet local needs, although this may be constrained for Options WH2, WH3 and WH4 given the size of these sites. Dwellings built to the lifetime homes standard can also be provided.

- 6.14 National planning guidance promotes the development of previously developed land before greenfield land. Options WH2 and WH5 would utilise previously developed land to the west of Hockley for residential uses which would protect the greenfield sites considered in Options WH2, WH3 and WH4 from development during the plan period. This previously developed site (identified in Options WH2 and WH5) has an existing employment use, although it is not designated as such and would therefore not result in the loss of employment land in the locality. Options WH2 and WH5 have greater sustainability credentials than the other options given that they seek to utilise existing previously developed land and have existing links to the highways network. Option WH5, however, also encompasses greenfield land to the west of the previously developed land which has the potential to provide an additional access point to the site along Church Road. Whilst this option would ensure greater accessibility and would enable lower density development in this location, it would not promote an efficient and effective use of land in accordance with national planning guidance.
- 6.15 Ensuring accessibility to local services and facilities, the highway network and public transport links are likely to be challenging for Options WH1, WH3 and WH4, which has an impact on sustainability. These options are also in closer proximity to areas designated for their ecological importance than Options WH2 and WH5. The impact on Local Wildlife Sites in proximity to Options WH1, WH3 and WH4 would need to be considered. A potential increase in recreational pressure on Hockley Woods from any development in ‘West Hockley’ would also need to be taken into consideration. Given that there is existing previously developed land in the locality, it is considered that Options WH1, WH3 or WH4 would have a greater negative impact on the open, rural nature of the area than alternatives such as, Options WH2 and WH5. These three options would therefore not contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe.
- 6.16 None of the options are situated within an area at risk of flooding, and whilst a range of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) are available to manage excess surface water, it is uncertain whether the size of the options (which relate to the dwelling requirements identified for this general location) would have an impact on the viability of some measures.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option WH2 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives. Option WH5 performs well, with the exception of including some greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available.

#### **South Hawkwell**

All of the options in the general location of ‘South Hawkwell’ would have a positive impact on ensuring that everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home through providing a range of housing types, tenure and affordability to meet local needs. Dwellings built to the lifetime homes standard can also be provided.

All of the options in the general location are situated to the south/south east of local services along Main Road in Hawkwell, and there is an existing bus route in proximity to the options which provides sustainable access to key services situated in the neighbouring centre of Hockley.

- 6.17 Through proposing development on one or two sites in close proximity to each other, Options SH1 and SH2 have a better relationship with existing residential development than Options SH3 and SH4, which would promote cohesion between existing and new communities. Option SH1, however, extends further north than Option SH2 to encompass more of the wooded area in the locality to the north of Rectory Road, whereas Option SH2 extends further to the west to adjoin existing employment land along Thorpe Road. Option SH1 may therefore have a greater impact on the existing habitat in this location than Option SH2.
- 6.18 The existing employment land to the west of Options SH2 and SH4 is allocated for residential development, however, if this site does not come forward for development, then a buffer may be needed to mitigate any impact potential impact of the employment site on residential amenity. If this site does come forward, Options SH2 and SH4 would be well related to it whereas the other options for this general location would not.
- 6.19 Options SH3 and SH4 propose sites which are severed from each other, which may potentially impact on the cohesion of any development coming forward on these sites with the existing community. These options, however, are likely to have less of an impact on local biodiversity as opposed to Option SH1 as they encompass less of the wooded area to the north of Rectory Road. The severance of the sites in Options SH3 and SH4 may also impact on the viability of some sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) and therefore the effectiveness of managing surface water in the locality.
- 6.20 There is an area at risk of flooding to the north east corner of Option SH1. This area generally affects all of the options. Within Option SH1 this area should be designated as public open space which is water-compatible development in accordance with national planning guidance. The arrangement of Options SH2 and SH3 should avoid this vulnerable area, however, it bounds the north eastern corner of the sites to the north of Rectory Road and so, in any case, it is advised that a green buffer is retained or created in this vulnerable area. The site to the north of Rectory Road within Option SH4 is also in close proximity to the area at risk. A range of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) are available which can be used to manage excess surface water within Options SH1 and SH2, however, as aforementioned, the severance of the sites in Options SH3 and SH4 may impact on the viability of some measures.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option SH2 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options for 'South Hawkwell'.
- (2) The impact of flood risk areas would need to be carefully considered, but development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.

#### **East Ashingdon**

- 6.21 All of the options in the general location of 'East Ashingdon' would have a positive impact on ensuring that everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home through providing a range of housing types, tenure and affordability to meet local needs. Dwellings built to the lifetime homes standard can also be provided.

- 6.22 A key requirement to accompany future residential development in this general location is to enable the expansion of, and provide improved access to, King Edmund School. Whereas Options EA1 and EA3 encompass land adjacent to the school site and have the potential to fulfil these requirements, Option EA2 is situated to the north of Brays Lane, and is therefore isolated from the school.
- 6.23 However, it is noted that given the list of requirements set out in the Core Strategy Submission Document it may not be feasible to physically implement some of these within the site options identified, such as the provision of youth and community facilities, (taking into consideration the site constraints for this general location and the need to avoid the unnecessary loss of Green Belt land). As such it is recommended that alternatively, and potentially more appropriately, this could take the form of offsite financial contributions for new facilities within the vicinity.
- 6.24 Although both Option EA1 and Option EA3 would enable the requirements in relation to King Edmund School to be delivered, Option EA3 would further extend residential development to the north of Brays Lane. In this case, it would have a greater negative impact on landscape character than Option EA1 and would be less able to provide a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary to the north of Brays Lane. Furthermore given dwelling requirements for this location and the potential for additional requirements to be delivered in elsewhere within the vicinity through the provision of financial contributions from development coming forward in ‘East Ashingdon’, the extension of Option EA3 to the north of Brays Lane may not make efficient use of land and unnecessarily encroach into undeveloped Green Belt land. This may undermine the openness of the Green Belt on a wider scale.
- 6.25 The options for ‘East Ashingdon’ are well related to Golden Cross parade of shops (which is situated to the south west) which provides sustainable access to the services located there. They are also well related to the highways network and a bus route along Ashingdon Road.
- 6.26 None of the options are situated within an area at risk of flooding, and whilst a range of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) are available to manage excess surface water, it is uncertain whether the size of Options EA1 and EA2 would have an impact on the viability of some measures. Furthermore the severance of the sites in Option EA3 may also impact on the viability of some SUDs measures.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EA1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options for this general location.
- (2) Access to King Edmund School can be provided within Options EA1 and EA3.
- (3) The provision of the list of requirements set out in the Core Strategy Submission Document could take the form of offsite financial contributions for new facilities within the vicinity.

## **South West Hullbridge**

- 6.27 Allocating development to the village of Hullbridge would provide properties for families and ensure that they do not have to leave the local area. It would have a positive impact on balanced communities and would promote the regeneration and enhancement of existing rural communities through ensuring the provision of accommodation for young people and sustaining the future of the local school.
- 6.28 All of the options in the general location of ‘South West Hullbridge’ would have a positive impact on ensuring that everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home through providing a range of housing types, tenure and affordability to meet local needs. Dwellings built to the lifetime homes standard can also be provided.
- 6.29 Although none of these options are situated within immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance, Options SWH1, SWH2 and SWH3 are situated within the Coastal Protection Belt (Option SWH3 to the greatest extent). The Coastal Protection Belt is, however, a landscape quality designation rather than an indication of ecological value. Whilst Option SWH4 avoids this designation, the area directly north of this option is existing residential development and so would expose the field to the north of Malyons Farm (which is designated Coastal Protection Belt) to development pressure. Consequently the exclusion of the land to the north may weaken the defensibility of Green Belt boundaries in the locality and undermine the openness of the Green Belt on a wider scale.
- 6.30 Options SWH1 and SWH2 are well related to the existing residential area and the local services and facilities situated within the village centre along Ferry Road. These options have good links with the local highway network through existing minor roads to the east and Lower Road to the south. However, it is recommended that for these options, and the other options, pedestrian links to the east are provided rather than road connections to prevent a possible negative impact on the village’s existing highway network, and to encourage more sustainable transport to the village’s services. When compared to Options SWH1, SWH2 and SWH3, however, there are fewer opportunities for Option SWH4 to provide pedestrian routes to the shops and facilities along Ferry Road. Furthermore whilst Option SWH4 has good links with the existing settlement, the severance between the sites may impact on community cohesion.
- 6.31 Option SWH3 does not have a good relationship with the existing settlement compared to Options SWH1 and SWH2. Local services and facilities may be less accessible for those in the community without access to private transport as Option SWH3 extends further away from the village centre (Ferry Road is situated to the east). The existing bus route, providing access to Rayleigh town centre to the south, may be less accessible for some as the option extends further to the north west than Options SWH1 and SWH2. Option SWH3 also does not connect to Lower Road, as opposed to the other options, which may further limit equal opportunities for the population in terms of access to services and facilities. This option would potentially require a new road link outside of the site which would further encroach into the Green Belt, however, pedestrian links for the existing minor roads to the east would be recommended.

- 6.32 In terms of landscape character, Option SWH2 is likely to have a greater impact than Option SWH1 as it extends further to the west than this option, past the junction of Lower Road, Watery Lane and Hullbridge Road, but the northern section does not extend as far to the west. The projection of Option SWH2 further to the west would potentially have a greater visual impact in the locality from the roads to the south compared to Option SWH1. However, it would still be better placed to provide a defensible Green Belt boundary than Options SWH3 and SWH4. Indeed, the arrangement of Option SWH3 would leave the area to the south undeveloped, which may weaken the Green Belt boundaries in the locality and undermine the openness of the Green Belt on a wider scale. Similarly, as mentioned above, Option SWH4 does not extend as far northwards as Options SWH1 and SWH2 which would expose the area to development pressure.
- 6.33 Although there is an area at risk of flooding to the west of this general location, the options are not within flood zone 2 or 3. The boundary of Option SWH3, however, is particularly close to this area. A range of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option SWH2 performs well against the sustainability objectives, but Option SWH1 performs even stronger.
- (2) Options SWH1 and SWH2 are well related to the existing residential area and the local services and facilities situated within the village centre along Ferry Road.
- (3) Option SWH2 may have a greater impact on landscape character than Option SWH1 in terms its projection further to the west, which would potentially have a greater visual impact in the locality from the roads to the south.
- (4) Pedestrian links to the east should be provided between the option taken forward and existing residential development rather than road connections to prevent an overburden on the village's existing highway network.

**South Canewdon**

- 6.34 Allocating development to the village of Canewdon would have a positive impact on balanced communities through providing properties for families and ensuring that they do not have to leave the local area.
- 6.35 It would also promote the regeneration and enhancement of existing rural communities through ensuring the provision of accommodation for young people and sustaining the future of the local school.
- 6.36 All of the options in the general location of 'South Canewdon' would have a positive impact on ensuring that everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home through providing a range of housing types, tenure and affordability to meet local needs, although it is uncertain whether such provision would be constrained for Options SC2 and SC3 given the size of these sites. Dwellings built to the lifetime homes standard can also be provided.

- 6.37 The location of Option SC3 is likely to have less of a visual impact on the rural character of the area as opposed to the other options for ‘South Canewdon’ as it is situated to the north of Anchor Lane and is primarily adjacent to existing residential development. The displacement of two dwellings within this option, and the severance of the two sites by the road leading north to St Nicholas Church, however, would have a negative impact on community cohesion.
- 6.38 On the other hand, Option SC1 to the south of Anchor Lane would extend the designated residential area of Canewdon further to the south, and the location of Option SC2 to the west of the road leading north towards St Nicholas Church would extend Canewdon further to the west.
- 6.39 In contrast Option SC4 proposes three small detached sites which have different relationships with the existing residential development and would have a negative impact on the sustainability of any development through encouraging piecemeal development on the edge of the village and presenting a much less defensible Green Belt boundary as opposed to Options SC1 and SC2. Option SC2 would also create an isolated area of designated residential development and may require adjacent dwellings to the east (which encompasses Option SC3) and west to be designated as existing residential development. This could encourage further development in this general location beyond that stipulated in the Core Strategy Submission Document.
- 6.40 There is generally considered to be good access to the local services which are situated in the centre of the village such as the primary school and village shops, which may ensure sustainable access to key services. All of the options have access to the local highway network (predominantly Anchor Lane and Lark Hill Road) (and in a manner that would be unlikely to direct traffic through the village itself) and the existing bus route provides access to Rochford town centre and Ashingdon to the south west of the village.
- 6.41 These sites are not situated within immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance, although parts of Options SC3 and SC4 encompass existing garden areas which have the potential to have greater biodiversity value than the agricultural land on which Options SC1 and SC2 are entirely situated. Option SC1 would have less of an impact on the Coastal Protection Belt, which are designated to the north west of this site, than the other options. Option SC2 is entirely situated within this designation, whereas the sites within Options SC3 and SC4 are within this designation, and within proximity to it, to varying degrees. The Coastal Protection Belt, whilst important from a landscape impact perspective, is a landscape quality designation rather than an indication of ecological value.
- 6.42 The impact of any development on the historic environment would need to be carefully considered with any development coming forward in these options, with the exception of Option SC1 which is situated the furthest from the two Conservation Areas in the village (the High Street and Canewdon Church). Both of these Conservation Areas are situated to the north/north east of this general location. Option SC3 has the potential to have the greatest impact as the main site bounds the southern boundary of the Canewdon Church Conservation Area which also encompasses St Nicholas Church which is a Grade II\* Listed Building. Options SC2 and SC4 are also in proximity to this Conservation Area to varying degrees.

6.43 None of the options are situated within an area at risk of flooding, and whilst a range of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) are available to manage excess surface water, it is uncertain whether the size of the options (which relate to the dwelling requirements identified for this general location) would have an impact on the viability of some measures.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Options SC1, SC2 and SC3 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives as opposed to Option SC4.
- (2) Options SC1 and SC2 could accommodate the housing requirements for this general location but would extend the designated residential area further to the south and west respectively.
- (3) Option SC3 is well related to the existing residential area and could accommodate the housing requirements for this general location, but proposes two segregated sites.
- (4) If Option SC3 is taken forward it should be amended to exclude the small site to the west of the road leading to St Nicholas Church to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained, and if possible extended northwards towards St Nicholas Church.
- (5) Careful consideration would need to be given to the design of any development if Option SC3 is taken forward given its proximity to the Canewdon Church Conservation Area which also encompasses a Grade II\* Listed Building (particularly if the option is extended northwards).

**South East Ashingdon**

- 6.44 All of the options in the general location of 'South East Ashingdon' would have a positive impact on ensuring that everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home through providing a range of housing types, tenure and affordability to meet local needs. Dwellings built to the lifetime homes standard can also be provided.
- 6.45 Of the three options for this general location, Option SEA1 has the best relationship with the existing residential area. Although Option SEA2 does relate well with existing development, it extends further to the east and north than Option SEA1 and subsequently may constrain any future expansion of King Edmund School given its arrangement. It therefore has the potential to be of detriment to the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities. Option SEA3 on the other hand extends further to the east than Option SEA1 and would not relate as well with the existing residential area as opposed to Options SEA1 and SEA2.
- 6.46 Option SEA1 also has the potential to provide more equal and sustainable access to local services and facilities, particularly for those without access to private transport, as opposed to the other options, given that Options SEA2 and SEA3 extend further to the east away from Ashingdon Road. The existing bus route and cycle route are also situated along Ashingdon Road, providing access to the train station and Rochford town centre to the south, may also be less accessible for some within Options SEA2 and SEA3 as they extend further to the east.

- 6.47 Although Option SEA1 has the potential to link to Ashingdon Road at several points, or minor roads to the south, a link to Oxford Road would require an additional link outside of the proposed area and would encroach further into the Green Belt. Option SEA3 also has the potential to link to Ashingdon Road, whereas Option SEA2 has the potential to link to both Ashingdon Road and Oxford Road.
- 6.48 The arrangement of Option SEA1, compared to Options SEA2 and SEA3, would ensure that a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained if this option was taken forward for development.
- 6.49 Although none of the options are located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance, there is a Local Wildlife Site to the south east and there is potential to provide a green link to this area of public open space. However, the impact of this on local biodiversity would need to be considered with any development in this general location.
- 6.50 None of the options are situated within an area at risk of flooding, and a range of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) are available to manage excess surface water.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option SEA1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options for this general location of ‘South East Ashingdon’.
- (2) Option SEA1 has the potential to provide more equal and sustainable access to local services and facilities, and would be able to create a more defensible Green Belt boundary compared to the other options.

**West Great Wakering**

- 6.51 With the exception of Options WGW3 and WGW4 (which are not well related to the existing residential area of Great Wakering and would promote coalescence with Shoebury to the south), the options in the general location of ‘West Great Wakering’ would have a positive impact on ensuring that everybody has the opportunity to live in a decent home through providing a range of housing types, tenure and affordability to meet local needs. Dwellings built to the lifetime homes standard can also be provided.
- 6.52 Furthermore the allocation of development within the village of Great Wakering would provide properties for families and ensure that they do not have to leave the local area. It would (depending on the location of new development) promote the regeneration and enhancement of existing rural communities through ensuring the provision of accommodation for young people and sustaining the future of the local school (with the exception of Options WGW3 and WGW4, due to their relatively poor relationship with the existing community).
- 6.53 Options WGW1 and WGW5 propose development in one location on the edge of the village rather than identifying segregated sites (as with Options WGW2 and WGW3), which would have a positive impact on community cohesion and thus the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities within Great Wakering. Although Option WGW1 is adjoined to the existing settlement, the west of the site is bounded by Star

Lane Industrial Estate. Cohesive development will therefore depend upon the redevelopment of this employment land for residential use. Whilst Option WGW4 proposes development in one location, it does not bound existing residential development. The north of the site is partly bounded by Star Lane Brickworks (the southern part of the Industrial Estate) which is proposed to be reallocated for residential development. Cohesive development will therefore depend upon the redevelopment of this site for residential use (as with Option WGW1 to a certain extent).

- 6.54 In contrast, Options WGW2 and WGW3 identify several sites on the edge of the village. The promotion of segregated development in these options would have a negative impact on community cohesion. The site to the west of Little Wakering Road and the site to the south of the High Street identified within Option WGW2 have a good relationship with existing residential development in the village, whereas the sites within Option WGW3 do not have a good relationship. However, the separation of the sites in these options would have a negative impact on the sustainability of any development through encouraging piecemeal development and presenting a much less defensible Green Belt boundary compared to Option WGW1, WGW4 and WGW5 for example. All of the options would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt in the area than Option WGW1.
- 6.55 Sustainable access to local services and facilities would be ensured within Options WGW1, WGW2 and WGW5, although the different land levels in the locality have the potential to impact on the accessibility of these, and would need to be overcome with any development coming forward. The impact of different land levels on accessibility would also need to be considered within Options WGW3 and WGW4.
- 6.56 Due to the severance of the sites in Option WGW3 and their extension further to the south away from the High Street, this option may be less able to ensure sustainable access to key services. The location of Option WGW4 to the south of Star Lane Industrial Estate would also ensure less sustainable access to local services and facilities within Great Wakering, particularly for those without access to private transport.
- 6.57 Option WGW1 would be able to provide a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary. Option WGW2, particularly given the arrangement of the site to the south of the High Street, would be less able to provide a defensible Green Belt boundary compared to WGW1. The sites within Option WGW3 would promote a defensible Green belt boundary, however, the severance of the sites would impact on the openness of the Green Belt on a wider scale than some of the other options. In addition, the option extends the settlement boundary to the south, reducing the undeveloped area that maintains the separation between Great Wakering and Shoebury. Whilst Option WGW4 would promote a defensible Green Belt boundary, as with Option WGW3, it would extend the urban area of Great Wakering further to the south, which reduces the undeveloped area between Great Wakering and Shoebury. Option WGW5 would be able to ensure that a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained, although there would be some concerns in respect of the boundary to the west.

- 6.58 There is a Local Wildlife Site in close proximity to all the options to varying degrees (with the exception of Option WGW5). The impact of any development would need to be managed to avoid harm to this Local Wildlife Site. A green buffer between the Local Wildlife Site and the options (with the exception of Option WGW5) should be provided to help mitigate the impact of development on the site.
- 6.59 None of the options are situated within an area at risk of flooding. A range of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) are available to manage excess surface water, however, the severance of the sites within Options WGW2 and WGW3 may impact on the viability of some sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) and therefore the effectiveness of managing surface water in the locality within these options.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Options WGW1 and WGW5 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options. These options promote development on one site which is well related to the existing residential settlement.
- (2) Cohesive development in this general location of 'West Great Wakering' would depend upon the redevelopment of Star Lane Industrial Estate for residential use if Option WGW1 is taken forward.
- (3) All of the options would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt in the area than Option WGW1.
- (4) The impact of different land levels in the locality on accessibility would also need to be considered.
- (5) Option WGW1 would likely create a more defensible Green Belt boundary than Option WGW5.
- (6) The impact of any development on the Local Wildlife Site (with the exception of Option WGW5) would need to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this site.
- (7) A green buffer between the Local Wildlife Site and the options (with the exception of Option WGW5) should be provided to help mitigate the impact of development on the site.

#### **Sites recommended in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment**

- 6.60 The SA summary for existing employment land identified to be reallocated for residential use; Star Lane Industrial Estate and Star Lane Brickworks (Option E9), Eldon Way Industrial Estate (Option E10), Stambridge Mills (Option E11) and Rawreth Industrial Estate (Option E12) can be found in the Employment Allocations section of this chapter.

#### **Housing with the potential to come forward through Area Action Plans**

- 6.61 The SA summary for existing employment land with the potential to contribute towards future dwelling supply (Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate) can be found in the Employment Allocations section of this chapter.

### **Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations**

- 6.62 All of the options, with the exception of Options GT4 and GT5, are situated within the western part of the District which accords with the Core Strategy Submission Document.
- 6.63 Options GT4, GT5 and GT7 due to their very small size and location detached from other existing sites and settlements would not have a positive impact on balanced communities. Similarly the remote location of Option GT6 may not have a positive impact. Options GT1 and GT2 would have a positive impact in terms of authorising the existing site and providing the existing community with greater certainty, but their location away from the residential area of Rayleigh may impact on equal opportunities in terms of access. Although Option GT3 would have a positive impact on balanced communities in terms of access to services and equal opportunities, this option (as well as the majority of other options) would not be able to accommodate the full pitch requirement for the District and require the allocation of multiple sites, likely given the options available, to be dispersed. However, Options GT1, GT2 (which is bigger than Option GT1) and GT6 would be able to accommodate the full pitch requirement. All of the options would have a positive impact on income and quality of life disparities.
- 6.64 The allocation of any of the options would help ensure that there is a balance of housing provision to serve all the District's communities. Options GT1 and GT2 encompass an existing, if unauthorised, Gypsy and Traveller site. However, there are limited opportunities for residents of Options GT1, GT2, GT4, and in particular GT6 to access local services and facilities through sustainable modes of travel. This may therefore have a negative impact on social inclusion, particularly for those without access to private transport. Although Options GT1 and GT2 are well related to the highway network (A1245) access to and from these options is a concern. The provision of pedestrian access to Rawreth Lane where public transport is located may also be challenging. This may discourage use of sustainable modes of transport. On the other hand, it should be noted that Option GT6 has the potential to have particularly good access to the highway network compared to other options. Options GT3, GT5 and GT7 may have a positive impact on social inclusion in terms of access and there is potential to improve public transport links in proximity to these options. However, given the scale of development proposed, provision of additional public transport is unlikely to be engendered by any of these sites.
- 6.65 Options GT1, GT2, GT3 and GT6 are not in proximity to areas designated for their ecological importance but the impact on existing hedgerows would need to be considered. Option GT2 would require grade 3 agricultural land to be allocated in addition to Option GT1, and Option GT3 is situated on greenfield land. Option GT5, however, is situated on previously developed land. Option GT4 may have an impact on biodiversity as it is currently greenfield land and it is in proximity to a Local Wildlife Site and Scheduled Ancient Monument. Similarly Option GT5 is in proximity to two Local Wildlife Sites/Ancient Woodland. As such the impact on these sites would need to be considered and mitigated against. Although Option GT6 is degraded former agricultural land, it is not used for agricultural purposes and so it may have local wildlife value. This would need to be taken into consideration if this site was allocated. Furthermore, whilst Option GT7 is not in proximity to areas of ecological importance, it is in close proximity to wooded areas and hedgerows which would need to be taken into consideration.

- 6.66 The proximity of Options GT1, GT2, GT3, GT4 and GT7 to opportunities for formal and informal recreation has the potential to positively contribute to healthy active lifestyles, whereas Options GT5 and GT6 have limited potential. Option GT3 is well related to a proposed Greenway, and there is a proposed Sustrans route to the north of Option GT7. The detachment of Options GT1 and GT2 from existing settlements and the relatively poor relationship with public transport links may impact on health, health inequalities and sustainable access to key services. Options GT3 and GT4 have the potential to reduce health inequalities.
- 6.67 Although permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches have the potential to have a positive impact on health inequalities through providing greater certainty for the community, the options (with the exception of Option GT3) do not relate strongly to existing residential areas and services. Option GT6, however, does not benefit from good public transport connections which could have a negative impact on sustainable access and health. High voltage power lines run over Option GT3 which are unlikely to be viable to move given the small-scale of the proposed land use, and the high costs of such an operation.
- 6.68 The impact on the historic environment, in particular the proximity to Listed Buildings with Options GT1 and GT2 and the proximity to a Scheduled Ancient Monument with Option GT4, would need to be considered. The existing unauthorised site within Options GT1 and GT2 already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it, and the allocation of these options would reduce the need to allocate undeveloped greenfield sites elsewhere in the District. On the other hand, the removal of the existing unauthorised site has the potential to have a positive impact on landscape character, if the openness of the land were to be re-established.
- 6.69 As with Option GT1, Option GT6 would reduce the need to use open greenfield land for development.
- 6.70 Option GT2 would involve a greater loss of greenfield land and development projecting into the open countryside (and therefore the Green Belt) than Option GT1. Option GT1 would create a defensible Green Belt boundary, whereas Option GT2 may not.
- 6.71 On the other hand, Options GT3, GT4 and GT7 are currently greenfield land which is designated as Green Belt. Whereas Option GT3 would enable a defensible Green Belt boundary to be created if allocated, Options GT4 and GT7 would not. Although Option GT5 is designated Green Belt it has been subject to some development and it is likely that its allocation may not create a defensible Green Belt boundary. Option GT6 is bounded to the north, east, and south by railway lines/roads. There is an opportunity to create a new defensible Green Belt boundary, albeit one which would create somewhat of an island of development within the Green Belt.
- 6.72 The allocation of Options GT1, GT2 and GT3 would help ensure the protection of better and more versatile agricultural land. However, Option GT2 projects into open greenfield land.

- 6.73 Option GT6 would utilise more Green Belt land than required, given the allocation requirement. As such, if taken forward a smaller area should be identified. The allocation of Options GT1 and GT2 would continue to raise concerns in terms of access to and from the site and the A1245, and Option GT6 may have some impact on the A1245, and Option GT3 may have some impact on London Road and the A1245. Highways access from these sites would therefore need to be negotiated carefully. Due to the scale of the sites, however, it is unlikely that there will be an impact on significant junctions in the locality for the majority of the options.
- 6.74 The majority of the options are not situated within an area at risk of flooding, with the exception of Option GT2 where an area of flood zone 2 and 3 encompasses the southern section of the site. There are also areas at risk in proximity to Options GT1, GT3 and GT6. None of the options are likely to include sustainable flood management measures due to their relatively small scale.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option GT1, GT2, GT3, GT6 and GT7 are situated within the western part of the District which accords with the Core Strategy Submission Document.
  - (2) Options GT1 and GT2 encompass an existing, if unauthorised, Gypsy and Traveller site, and perform strongly against the sustainability objectives.
  - (3) Option GT3 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives, however, high voltage power lines run through this option site and are unlikely to be viable to move given the scale of the potential development.
  - (4) Option GT6, if allocated in its entirety, would entail the allocation of more Green Belt land than required.
  - (5) Option GT3 would require the reallocation of undeveloped greenfield Green Belt land.
  - (6) Option GT2 would involve a greater loss of greenfield land and development projecting into the open countryside (and therefore the Green Belt) than Option GT1.
  - (7) Option GT1 would create a defensible Green Belt boundary, whereas Option GT2 may not.
  - (8) It is unlikely that additional sites would need to be allocated if Options GT1, GT2 or GT6 are taken forward.
  - (9) Highways access from Options GT1, GT2, GT3 and GT6 would need to be negotiated carefully if taken forward.
- 6.75 Planning permission was sought for the site identified within Option GT1 (10/00582/COU), and permission was refused on 1 November 2010. An appeal was lodged and subsequently refused by notice of 6 December 2011. In balancing the range of considerations, Green Belt and highway issues were very much weighted against the site, and the Inspector's Report concluded that "Although the overall implications of the proposal in terms of sustainability would be neutral the total level of harm that would arise would be considerable."(paragraph 76).

## **Employment Allocations**

### **Option E1 Baltic Wharf**

- 6.76 This option would allocate an existing employment site situated to the north east of the District on the banks of the river Crouch for future employment use. The Core Strategy Submission Document seeks to protect the future of the employment opportunities available at this site and enhance the east to west connectivity of the highway network. This site will be protected through the planning process which has the potential to secure the future of the employment opportunities in this area, ensure the sustainability of existing communities through the continued provision of local employment opportunities and positively contribute to ensuring equal opportunities in the area.
- 6.77 However, it is situated in a relatively inaccessible location, compared to the western section of the District, which is unlikely to encourage people to use sustainable transport modes. Nevertheless there is potential to increase the public transport service to this location. In terms of access to jobs, it may have a negative impact on social inclusion in this regard. Furthermore it is adjacent to the river Crouch which is protected through a range of nature conservation designations and the continued protection of this site may therefore impact on the District's estuaries. There is a recognised need, however, to strike a balance between rural employment opportunities and the protection and conservation of the natural environment. The retention of this site is likely to have a nominal impact on the historic environment. Although it is situated within flood zone 2 and 3, the site is protected by a sea wall and wharves are water-compatible development (as defined in PPS25).

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E1 is an existing employment site which, although it is situated in a relatively inaccessible location, performs well against the sustainability objectives.

### **Option E2 Swaines Industrial Estate**

- 6.78 The identified site within this option is existing employment land situated within the designated residential envelope to the north west of Rochford town centre. The Core Strategy Submission Document seeks to protect the future of the employment opportunities available at this site. As per Option E1, this site will be protected through the planning process which has the potential to secure the future of the employment opportunities in this area, ensure the sustainability of existing communities through the continued provision of local employment opportunities and positively contribute to ensuring equal opportunities in the area. This option also has the potential to reduce out-commuting.
- 6.79 The protection of this existing employment site which is situated within the existing residential development of Rochford, in close proximity to a bus route, and to the north/north west of a train station may contribute positively to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to local jobs. This site is not situated in proximity to any nature conservation designations, and thus the continued retention of this existing employment site has the potential to conserve natural/semi-natural habitats. It is also likely to have a nominal impact on the historic environment due to the built up nature of its immediate environment. This site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E2 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.

**Option E3 Purdeys Industrial Estate**

- 6.80 This option identifies a designated employment site situated to the south east of Rochford town centre. The Core Strategy Submission Document seeks to protect the future of the employment opportunities available at this site. As per Option E1, this site will be protected through the planning process which has the potential to secure the future of the employment opportunities in this area, ensure the sustainability of existing communities through the continued provision of local employment opportunities and positively contribute to ensuring equal opportunities in the area. This option also has the potential to reduce out-commuting. Although it is well related to the proposed Sustrans route and an existing bus route, it is isolated from Rochford town centre. There is, however, potential to increase the public transport service to this location.
- 6.81 It is situated on the banks of the river Roach which is protected through a range of nature conservation designations, and thus continuing to protect this site may impact on the District's estuaries. There is a need, however, to strike a balance between local employment opportunities and the protection and conservation of the natural environment. The retention of this designated employment site is likely to have a nominal impact on potential archaeological deposits surviving in the area. Due to its estuarine location, small parts of the identified area are within flood zone 2 and 3 (to the north east and south west of the site) and it is bounded by flood risk areas to the north and south. This site is, however, existing employment land whose on-site uses can be classified within the 'less vulnerable' category of PPS25 (which includes shops, general storage and storage and distribution).

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E3 is an existing employment site which performs well against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) There is potential to improve public transport links to this site.

### **Option E4 Riverside Industrial Estate**

- 6.82 This option encompasses an established employment site situated on the edge of Rochford town centre. The Core Strategy Submission Document seeks to protect the future of the employment opportunities available at this site. As per Option E1, this site will be protected through the planning process which has the potential to secure the future of the employment opportunities in this area, ensure the sustainability of existing communities through the continued provision of local employment opportunities and positively contribute to ensuring equal opportunities in the area. This option also has the potential to reduce out-commuting.
- 6.83 This option is well related to a proposed Greenway and the proposed Sustrans route. It is also situated on an existing bus route and is in proximity to the town centre to the north and train station to the north west. There is potential to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation other than the private car, and there is potential to increase the public transport service to this location. This option is located to the west of the river Roach which is protected through a range of nature conservation designations. Due to the location of this site, it may continue to have an impact on sites designated for their nature conservation interest. However, it is likely that the retention of this existing employment site would have a nominal impact on potential archaeological deposits surviving in the area. Although the site is situated within flood zone 2 and 3, it is existing employment land whose on-site uses, as with Option E3, can be classified within the 'less vulnerable' category of PPS25.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E4 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.

### **Option E5 Rochford Business Park**

- 6.84 This option would allocate an established employment site situated to the west of London Southend Airport as employment land. The Core Strategy Submission Document seeks to protect the future of the employment opportunities available at this site. As with the other options concerning the retention of existing employment, this site will be protected through the planning process which has the potential to secure the future of the employment opportunities in this area, ensure the sustainability of existing communities through the continued provision of local employment opportunities and positively contribute to ensuring equal opportunities in the area. This option is well related to London Southend Airport which is situated to the south east of this option and its allocation has the potential to reduce out-commuting. It would not, however, enable access for all sections of the community due to its somewhat isolated location.
- 6.85 It is situated to the south of the District and has good access to the highway network. Although it is situated away from the existing residential areas, in a location where there is limited public transport available, there is an existing footpath and cycle network from Rochford town centre running past this existing employment site. There is also potential to increase the public transport service to this location. Furthermore the allocation of this site is unlikely to reduce the need to travel due to its isolation

from existing urban centres. It is not situated within any nature conservation designations, and although the site is located to the south of the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area, this is a landscape quality designation rather than an indication of ecological value. As with other options, retaining this existing employment site is likely to have a nominal impact on potential archaeological deposits surviving in the area. Furthermore whilst this site is not situated within a flood risk area, there are areas at risk further to the south, east and north of this location.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E5 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) There is potential to improve public transport links to this site.

**Option E6 Imperial Park Industrial Estate**

- 6.86 This option encompasses existing employment land situated to the west of Rayleigh. The Core Strategy Submission Document seeks to protect the future of the employment opportunities available at this site. As with the other options concerning the retention of existing employment, this site will be protected through the planning process which has the potential to secure the future of the employment opportunities in this area, ensure the sustainability of existing communities through the continued provision of local employment opportunities and positively contribute to ensuring equal opportunities in the area. Due its location, this option seeks to retain an existing employment site where large volumes of people and/or transport movements are located.
- 6.87 As this option is situated within an existing residential area, it has the potential to enable access for all sections of the community. It is also situated on a bus route, which increases the accessibility of those without access to a private car to local services. There is potential to improve this provision and there may be opportunities for encouraging walking and cycling. This option is not in proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats. Retaining this existing employment site is likely to have a nominal impact on potential archaeological deposits surviving in the area. This site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding. Furthermore, although Rawreth Industrial Estate, which is situated to the west of the site, has recently been designated as an AQMA but has been identified to be reallocated for residential development.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E6 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.

**Option E7 Brook Road Industrial Estate**

- 6.88 This option identifies existing employment land situated to the south of Rayleigh. The Core Strategy Submission Document seeks to protect the future of the employment opportunities available at this site. As with the other options concerning the retention of existing employment, this site will be protected through the planning process which

has the potential to secure the future of the employment opportunities in this area, ensure the sustainability of existing communities through the continued provision of local employment opportunities and positively contribute to ensuring equal opportunities in the area. This option is embedded within the existing urban area and seeks to retain an existing employment site where large volumes of people and/or transport movements are located. It therefore has the potential to enable access for all sections of the community.

- 6.89 This option is situated to the south of the District and whilst it has good links to the highway network (A127), there are limited bus routes along this road. It is unlikely that this option would increase the availability of sustainable transport modes significantly, although there is potential to increase the public transport service to this location. This option is not in proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats, and it is likely that the retention of this existing employment site would have a nominal impact on any potential archaeological deposits surviving in the area. Part of this site to the south west is situated within flood zone 2. There is also an area of flood zone 2 and 3 running the length of the industrial estate to the south of Brook Road. However, this is existing employment land whose on-site uses can be classified, as with Options E3 and E4, within the 'less vulnerable' category of PPS25 (which includes general storage and storage and distribution).

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E7 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) There is potential to improve public transport links to this site.

**Option E8 Aviation Way Industrial Estate**

- 6.90 This option is a designated employment site situated to the south of Rochford adjacent to London Southend Airport. The Core Strategy Submission Document seeks to protect the future of the employment opportunities available at this site. As with the other options concerning the retention of existing employment, this site will be protected through the planning process which has the potential to secure the future of the employment opportunities in this area, ensure the sustainability of existing communities through the continued provision of local employment opportunities and positively contribute to ensuring equal opportunities in the area. This option is well related to London Southend Airport which is situated to the south of this option. The potential of the airport and adjoining employment land at Aviation Way will be explored through the London Southend Airport Joint Area Action Plan. Given the location of this site, this option would seek to retain an existing employment site where large volumes of transport movements are located.

- 6.91 Whilst there is limited public transport in close proximity to this existing employment site, there is potential to increase the public transport service to this location. There is also an existing footpath and cycle network from Rochford town centre running past this existing employment site. This option is situated away from the existing residential areas within the District and has good links to the highway network. The site is not situated within any nature conservation designations; although it is acknowledged that

the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area is located further to the north west (to the west of Cherry Orchard Way). Whilst the retention of this site may have a nominal impact on the potential archaeological deposits surviving in the area, any development in this location should carefully consider the potential for surviving deposits beyond the boundary of the airport. Parts of this option to the south are predominantly designated as flood zone 2 with smaller sections of flood zone 3. An area of flood zone 2 and 3 also extends along the southern boundary of the site. However, this is existing employment land whose on-site uses, as with other options, can be classified within the 'less vulnerable' category of PPS25.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E8 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) There is potential to improve public transport links to this site.
- (3) Any development in this location should carefully consider the potential for surviving deposits beyond the boundary of the airport.

**Option E9 Star Lane Industrial Estate (northern section)**

- 6.92 This option encompasses the northern section of Star Lane Industrial Estate. This Industrial Estate has been identified in the Employment Land Study 2008 as having poor quality building stock and is recommended for reallocation for other uses. It is adjoined to the existing settlement of Great Wakering to the north and is in proximity to the general location 'West Great Wakering'. Ideally this option would be part of a comprehensive development alongside any future development to the west of Great Wakering. This would, however, depend on deliverability of the Industrial Estate in conjunction with any other residential development to the west of Great Wakering. This option, in conjunction with the land designated as Star Lane Industrial Estate, can provide a wide range of facilities to meet the ongoing and future needs of the local community. This would, however, be dependant upon the spatial relationship between any land allocated for residential development to the west of Great Wakering and the Industrial Estate, which would therefore impact on the sustainability of any development in Great Wakering.
- 6.93 This option would displace existing businesses on this employment site. Any redevelopment of the site for residential development should be done in conjunction with the relocation of existing employment uses. Failure to provide alternative accommodation for existing employment uses will have a negative impact on sustainability objectives.
- 6.94 This site has good links to the existing settlement, and local services and facilities within the village centre, and additional facilities will also be provided in this general location. This option has the potential to provide a good link to the existing highway network although it would not be viable to provide a pedestrian link directly to the High Street from this site. There is a bus route along Star Lane and the High Street (which has the potential to be improved), and it is in proximity to a Greenway, which can provide an alternative mode of transportation. These factors would have the potential

to have a positive impact on equal opportunities, health inequalities, and opportunities for informal recreation, and has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring sustainable access. However, whilst providing a range of housing types, tenure and affordability, in conjunction with Star Lane Brickworks to the south, this option would lead to the loss of employment land in the locality. However, additional employment land will need to be reallocated in proximity to Great Wakering as identified in the Core Strategy Submission Document. Furthermore the cumulative impact of any development of this option with any development in the general location to the 'West of Great Wakering' would need to be carefully considered.

- 6.95 Although this option is not situated within any nature conservation designations, it is in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site, which may be impacted by any development in this option, for example through increased recreational pressure. Nevertheless public open space will be provided within this option and so this may reduce recreational pressure on the existing Local Wildlife Site. If located to the eastern/south eastern section of the site, the public open space could provide a buffer between residential development and the Local Wildlife Site. It may also provide opportunities for new habitat creation and could facilitate species movement. This would need to be carefully considered and mitigated against, as appropriate. The northern part of this existing employment site is currently in use therefore it is unlikely that this section would be of ecological value. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered. This site has clearly defined boundaries and presents a strong, defensible Green Belt boundary. This defensibility, however, may depend on the preferred option in the area to the west of Great Wakering.
- 6.96 As this site is previously developed land it has the potential to be contaminated, it could require decontamination before any development takes place. It is not within an area at risk of flooding, however, there would need to be infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades to the foul sewerage network. Given the current uses on the Industrial Estate it is likely that the land would need to be decontaminated before any development takes place.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E9 (the northern section of the Industrial Estate) performs strongly against the sustainability objectives within the context of being reallocated from employment to residential use.
- (2) This option is currently in use for employment purposes. Any redevelopment of the site for residential development should be done in conjunction with the relocation of existing employment uses. Failure to provide alternative accommodation for existing employment uses will have a negative impact on sustainability objectives.
- (3) Comprehensive development alongside any future development in the general location 'West Great Wakering' would enhance the sustainability credentials of this option still further.
- (4) There is potential to improve public transport links to this site.

- (5) The impact of any redevelopment of this site on the Local Wildlife Site and historic environment would need to be carefully considered.
- (6) Public open space within any proposal for redevelopment of this site should be located to the eastern/south eastern section of the site to provide a buffer between residential development and the Local Wildlife Site.
- (7) This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.

**Option E9 Star Lane Brickworks (southern section of Industrial Estate)**

- 6.97 This option encompasses the southern section of Star Lane Industrial Estate (the Brickworks) which is disused at present. This Industrial Estate has been identified in the Employment Land Study 2008 as having poor quality building stock and is recommended for reallocation for other uses. The site is segregated from the existing settlement of Great Wakering by the northern section of the Industrial Estate which is currently in use, although both sections are identified for reallocation in the Core Strategy Submission Document. Cohesive development would therefore depend upon the reallocation of both sections of the Industrial Estate for residential development. If the northern section does not come forward for development then this would lead to piecemeal development which would impact on community cohesion. Nevertheless, as with the northern section, it relates well with the general location 'West Great Wakering' and ideally reallocation of the Industrial Estate would be part of a comprehensive development in the locality. Similarly the provision of facilities to meet the ongoing and future need depends upon the spatial relationship between any land allocated for residential development to the west of Great Wakering and the Industrial Estate, thus impacting on the sustainability of any development in this location.
- 6.98 There are a range of local services and facilities in proximity to this site, although this option extends further to the south away from these which may impact on accessibility and thus equal opportunities. Enhanced accessibility to local services and facilities would depend upon the northern section of the Industrial Estate coming forward for development prior to the southern section and the spatial relationship between any land allocated for residential development to the west of Great Wakering (which may have the potential to provide pedestrian links to the High Street). There is a bus route along Star Lane and the High Street, which has the potential to be improved and can provide sustainable access to these services and facilities, particularly for those without access to private transport. The site is also in proximity to a Greenway. These routes can therefore encourage alternative methods of travel.
- 6.99 This option would also provide a range of housing types, tenure and affordability; although in conjunction with the northern section it would lead to the loss of employment land in the locality. This site as opposed to the northern section of the Industrial Estate does not have good links to the existing settlement and local services and facilities within the village centre in terms of providing pedestrian access. This may, however, depend upon the preferred location for development to the 'West of Great Wakering'. Furthermore, as with the northern section, the cumulative impact of any development of this option with any development in the general location to the 'West of Great Wakering' would need to be carefully considered.

- 6.100 Although this option is not situated within any nature conservation designations, it is situated in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site, which may be impacted by any development in this option, for example through increased recreational pressure. Nevertheless public open space will be provided within this option and so this may reduce recreational pressure on the existing Local Wildlife Site. If located to the eastern section of the site, the public open space could provide a buffer between residential development and the Local Wildlife Site. It may also provide opportunities for new habitat creation and could facilitate species movement. This would need to be carefully considered and mitigated against, as appropriate. This part of the Industrial Estate is currently disused and therefore has the potential to have ecological value. Any development may have some impact on species diversity, although there is potential to incorporate wildlife habitats within it. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered. This option would reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land, thus preserving Green Belt land in the locality. It has clearly defined boundaries and presents a strong, defensible Green Belt boundary. This defensibility, however, may depend on the preferred option in the area to the west of Great Wakering.
- 6.101 Given that this site is previously developed land it has the potential to be contaminated, it could require decontamination before any development takes place. The site is not within an area at risk of flooding, although there would need to be infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades to the foul sewerage network. Given that this site is previously developed land it is likely that the land would need to be decontaminated before any development takes place.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E9 (the southern section of the Industrial Estate) performs strongly against the sustainability objectives within the context of being reallocated from employment to residential use.
- (2) Although the identified area is allocated for employment purposes, this option encompasses land which is currently disused.
- (3) Comprehensive development alongside any future development in the general location 'West Great Wakering' would enhance the sustainability credentials of this option still further.
- (4) The impact of any redevelopment of this site on the Local Wildlife Site and historic environment would need to be carefully considered.
- (5) Public open space within any proposal for redevelopment of this site should be located to the eastern section of the site to provide a buffer between residential development and the Local Wildlife Site. .
- (6) Enhanced accessibility to local services and facilities would depend upon the northern section of the Industrial Estate coming forward for development prior to the southern section and the spatial relationship between any land allocated for residential development to the west of Great Wakering (which may have the potential to provide pedestrian links to the High Street).
- (7) This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.

### **Option E10 Eldon Way Industrial Estate**

- 6.102 This option, which encompasses both Eldon Way Industrial Estate and the adjacent Foundry Industrial Estate, is situated to the north of the centre of Hockley. It is situated in close proximity to Hockley train station and an existing bus route.
- 6.103 This option has the potential to reduce the need to travel and enable access for all sections of the community and there is potential to increase the availability of sustainable transport modes in the locality, as well as opportunities to encourage walking and cycling.
- 6.104 Due to the location of this option, Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate is situated where large volumes of people and/or transport movements are located. The location of this option therefore has the potential to ensure sustainable access to key services and to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion. As a mixed use development, it would introduce residential development into an area where the residents have good access to services, facilities and public transport provision; and would also provide employment use, service and facilities within an accessible location to the wider population.
- 6.105 Any development of Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate and the associated sustainability implications at a more detailed level, however, will be determined through the production of the Hockley Area Action Plan. However, the allocation of this site for mixed use would act as an interim designation prior to the finalisation of the Hockley Area Action Plan and may enable a wider scope of reasonable/appropriate options to be derived for the site.
- 6.106 Although this is an existing employment site which is currently in use, a number of the existing units are vacant. Redevelopment of the site should incorporate employment generating uses.
- 6.107 This option is not situated within any nature conservation designations, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats. It is located within the developed area of Hockley close to the centre and whilst there is potential for surviving archaeological deposits in open areas, the extensive development over the last 50 years has significantly altered the Historic Environment elsewhere. The impact of any development on the Listed Building to the south/south east of the Industrial Estate, however, would need to be considered.
- 6.108 This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, and there is capacity within the existing drainage system to accommodate any development (although the extent of this will be determined through the Hockley Area Action Plan). This option is previously developed land, which has potential for a mixed-use development (as identified in the SHLAA (2009)). It could, however, require decontamination before any development takes place. This non-Green Belt site also has the potential to safeguard other land in the District and ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected as far as practicable. Given the current uses on the Industrial Estate, however, it is likely that the land would need to be decontaminated before any development takes place.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E10 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives within the context of being reallocated from employment to mixed use.
- (2) This is an existing employment site which is currently in use, although a number of the existing units are vacant. Redevelopment of the site should incorporate employment generating uses in order to perform well against sustainability objectives.
- (3) It is noted that any redevelopment of the Industrial Estate will be determined through the Hockley Area Action Plan.
- (4) This option is well related to the centre of Hockley and public transport links.
- (5) This option would act as an interim designation prior to the finalisation of the Hockley Area Action Plan. It may enable a wider scope of reasonable/ appropriate options to be derived for the site.
- (6) This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.

**Option E11 Stambridge Mills**

- 6.109 This option comprises a disused employment site to the east of Rochford.
- 6.110 This option is within flood zone 2 and 3, and residential development should be directed away from such areas where appropriate alternatives are available. The Exceptions Test would have to be passed before development can take place. Appropriate flood defences will have to be implemented prior to any residential redevelopment. Such defences could also benefit existing communities in the locality.
- 6.111 The site is detached from the existing settlement, which may impact on accessibility, particularly for those without access to a private car. In addition, the option's location to the east of the Rochford town centre and the layout of the highway infrastructure in the locality are such that the majority of traffic from the site is likely to be directed through the junction of North Street, East Street, South Street, West Street and North Street. There is already some concern in respect of air quality at this junction, and increased congestion here may have negative implications.
- 6.112 The constrained nature of the site means that it may be challenging to incorporate a range of house types, public space, or the creation of new habitats.
- 6.113 It is situated on the banks of the river Roach which is protected through a range of nature conservation designations. Therefore any development may have some impact on species diversity. Any specific development coming forward should be designed such as to avoid harm to this nature conservation designation, specifically through discouraging human activity within the areas designated for their ecological value along the banks of the Roach. This site is also adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site (R28. River Roach at Rochford) to the west. Although Local Wildlife Sites may be used for recreational purposes, it is important that development does not have a negative impact on them.

6.114 This option would entail redevelopment of a disused, previously developed site outside of the Green Belt, reducing the pressure to develop on greenfield and Green Belt. Given the existing bulk and mass of the current development, it also represents an opportunity to improve impact on the landscape.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Concerns with this option include flood risk, its detachment from the existing residential area, and the impact of vehicular traffic from the site on the air quality in Rochford centre.
- (2) Notwithstanding the aforementioned concerns with this option, it also has significant sustainability benefits as it would entail redevelopment of derelict, previously developed land; redevelopment of a site which currently has a significant impact on the landscape; and would reduce the need to develop on greenfield and Green Belt land elsewhere in the District.

**Option E12 Rawreth Industrial Estate**

6.115 Rawreth Industrial Estate is an identified 'bad neighbour' to the surrounding residential development to the south and east. It is adjoined to the existing settlement and is in proximity to the general location 'North of London Road'. Ideally this option would be part of a comprehensive development to the west of Rayleigh. This option has the potential to ensure the regeneration and enhancement of local communities. It is in proximity to a range of services and facilities which would enable equal opportunities in terms of access. However, at present this option only has a link with Rawreth Lane and would therefore mean that some services, such as those located along London Road, would be less accessible for the local community. This may also impact on traffic and accessibility along Rawreth Lane. As such the cumulative impact of any development of this option with any development to the 'North of London Road' would need to be carefully considered. The accessibility of local services along London Road to this option may depend on the potential to provide an additional link (potentially a circular public transport route) with any comprehensive redevelopment in the general location 'North of London Road'. Nevertheless, there is public transport available along Rawreth Lane, increasing the accessibility of those without access to a private car to local services and facilities, as well as potentially having a positive impact on social inclusion. This option would provide a range of housing types and tenure, affordability.

6.116 This option would displace existing businesses on this employment site. Any redevelopment of the site for residential development should be done in conjunction with the relocation of existing employment uses. Failure to provide alternative accommodation for existing employment uses will have a negative impact on sustainability objectives.

6.117 This option would lead to the loss of employment land in this general location; however, the Core Strategy Submission Document seeks to allocate land to the west of Rayleigh for additional employment land. The option is accessible to a range of formal and informal leisure facilities which promote recreation, have the potential to improve health and reduce health inequalities, and may also encourage active,

healthy lifestyles. There is a Greenway proposed to the west of Rayleigh, however, it may be more difficult to connect this, and its connectivity may depend on the area allocated to the 'North of London Road'. Furthermore in this general location, parkland to the west of Rayleigh will be allocated and will be accessible to all sections of the community. There may also be opportunities to incorporate green infrastructure links into the development.

- 6.118 The site is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance, and as this is an existing employment land which is in use, it is unlikely that this option would be of ecological value given its current uses. Any redevelopment has the potential to integrate within it opportunities for new habitat creation. The development of parkland, depending on its relationship with this option and any development allocated to the 'North of London Road', has the potential to facilitate species movement and colonisation. The area is largely developed so, in terms of the historic environment, there is likely to be little sensitivity to change. The cumulative impact of any development to the west of Rayleigh on the Listed Building to the west of the site would need to be carefully considered.
- 6.119 This option is a previously developed site on the urban fringe which has clearly defined boundaries and presents a strong, defensible Green Belt boundary. This defensibility, however, will depend on the preferred option in the area to the 'North of London Road'. Given that this site is previously developed land and has been in use for a variety of industrial activities, it is highly likely to require decontamination before any development takes place. An area to the south west of this option is within flood zone 2. An area of public open space will be incorporated within the development which may be provided to the south west of the site to mitigate against the risk of flooding and SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats. Given the current uses on the Industrial Estate it is likely that the land would need to be decontaminated before any development takes place.
- 6.120 Rawreth Industrial Estate has recently been designated an AQMA. The cause of the poor air quality in the locality is thought to be a result of current employment activity at this site. As such, its redevelopment for alternative uses would improve local air quality.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E12 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives within the context of being reallocated from employment to residential use.
- (2) This option is currently in use for employment purposes. Any redevelopment of the site for residential development should be done in conjunction with the relocation of existing employment uses. Failure to provide alternative accommodation for existing employment uses will have a negative impact on sustainability objectives.
- (3) Comprehensive development alongside any future development in the general location 'North of London Road, Rayleigh' would enhance the sustainability credentials of this option still further.

- (4) Although public transport links are available, the accessibility of local services along London Road may depend on the potential to provide an additional link (potentially a circular public transport route) with any comprehensive redevelopment in the general location 'North of London Road'.
- (5) Public open space will be incorporated within any development coming forward on this site which may be provided to the south west of the site (where there is an area of flood zone 2).
- (6) This option presents a strong, defensible Green Belt boundary.
- (7) This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.

### **Additional Employment Land to be Allocated**

#### **West of Rayleigh**

- 6.121 Options E14, E15, E16 and E18 encompass varying degrees of previously developed land and grade 3 agricultural land. Option E13 encompasses just previously developed land. Option E17, however, is entirely situated on agricultural land and would therefore encroach unnecessarily into open countryside. It would have a greater impact on the open character of this particular locality. Options E16, E17 and E18 would retain more employment opportunities than Options E13, E14 and E15, and would be able to accommodate different quantum of displaced businesses from existing 'bad neighbour' sites. All of the options are well related to strategic transport routes. Most of the options would have a positive impact on balanced communities through, for example, the retention of local employment opportunities, and ensuring the phasing of infrastructure to support the potential uses such as high quality accommodation with a versatile layout and design to meet ongoing and future needs.
- 6.122 Options E13, E15, E16 and E17 are isolated from the existing residential development which may impact on the accessibility of local employment opportunities. However, this isolation would ensure that the employment sites do not become 'bad neighbours' to any surrounding uses. Nevertheless there is an existing bus route along London Road which may be improved to ensure sustainable access to these options. Option E14, however, extends towards existing residential development which would enhance the accessibility, but it has the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' to the surrounding residential uses.
- 6.123 The isolation of Option E18 means it performs relatively poorly in terms of infrastructure provision, accessibility (particularly for those without access to private transport), social exclusion and equal opportunities. It is unlikely to become a 'bad neighbour' due to the lack of surrounding land uses. However, due to the presence of existing bus routes, there is potential to enhance the connectivity/accessibility of this site to those without access to private transport particularly given the proposed land use, and it is very well related to the existing highway network which will have benefits in terms of viability for employment use, and therefore is positive from an economic perspective in this regard. There may be some impact on the A1245 if this option were taken forward, and highways access from this site may need to be negotiated carefully.

- 6.124 The alternative options are situated further away from the primary school located along Little Wheatley Chase than Option E14, which has the potential to become a 'bad neighbour'. However, if Option E17 was brought forward for employment use, the impact on the options for residential development in the area to the 'North of London Road' would need to be carefully considered, as would its impact on the ability of a green buffer between the new residential development and the A1245. Opportunities to improve health and wellbeing may be improved through the incorporation of green infrastructure within the options, and the options (with the exception of Option E18) have the potential to link with a proposed Greenway. The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the sites, if taken forward, in the future.
- 6.125 New high quality and versatile employment land may improve business development, although this is not site specific. There is potential for Option E13 (depending on exact space requirements) to accommodate light industry/office uses, with 'heavier' uses (such as B2 uses) allocated to a location more detached from existing residential areas, to avoid creating a 'bad neighbour' situation (for example Option E18).
- 6.126 Allocating employment land in the general location to the west of Rayleigh, with the exception, to a certain extent, of Option E18, could have a positive impact on social inclusion. These options would not secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District as any allocation to the west of Rayleigh would be designated to compensate for the deallocation of existing employment sites for other uses. The relationship of the general locations with neighbouring economic centres may not reduce out-commuting. Option E18 has the potential to accommodate a significant proportion of employment land without impacting on residential amenity or the local highway network.
- 6.127 None of the options are located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. Options E13, E14, E15, and E16 would not lead to a loss of biodiversity as they encompass a brownfield site which is currently in use and grade 3 agricultural land. There are, however, several ponds on the brownfield site which may have biodiversity value, and as such, potential disturbance or habitat loss would need to be mitigated against. Option E17 is grade 3 agricultural land. However, Option E18 is not brownfield land but spoilt grade 3 agricultural land although it is not used as such and has been subject to a number of uses in recent times. This option therefore has potential to be of ecological value given its largely disused nature. Any impact on hedgerows to the north, east and west of Option E18 would need to be taken into consideration.
- 6.128 There may be some archaeological deposits within the general location, although at present this is unknown due to the lack of archaeological field work undertaken. This will need to be taken into consideration. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to any of the options.
- 6.129 Options E13, E14, E16 and E17 would generally promote a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary, whereas Options E15, may not. On the other hand Option E18 would ensure a defensible Green Belt boundary and may preserve the character and openness of Green Belt in other locations but would create an island of development within the Green Belt. None of the options are situated within an area at risk of

flooding, however, an area to the north of Options E13, E14, E15 and E16 is at risk of flooding. There is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 along the eastern section of Option 17 and towards the north of the site.

6.130 Additional land would need to be provided if Options E13, E14, E15, E16 and E17 were taken forward to compensate for existing employment land to be reallocated. It may not therefore ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected. However, given the size of Option E18 compared to the other options, this option would ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected as far as practicable.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option E13 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) Options E14, E15, E16 and E17 perform well against these objectives, with the notable exception that these options encompass varying degrees of greenfield land in addition to the brownfield site.
- (3) Option E17 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives, with the notable exception of it being on greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available.
- (4) Option E18 generally performs well against these objectives, although it is less accessible, in terms of sustainable access this option performs less well than the other options.
- (5) Any impact on hedgerows to the north, east and west of Option E18 would need to be taken into consideration.
- (6) Two areas to the west of Rayleigh could be allocated for employment use as follows, and this would perform well in sustainability terms:

6.131 Option E13 could be allocated for employment use, but this could be limited to light industry/office use due to the proximity of these sites to residential development to the east. The size of the site taken forward would therefore depend on the amount of such uses required for this general location.

6.132 A proportion of Option E18 could be allocated for employment use (depending on the amount of heavier employment development required for this general location). Although this site is located further away from the existing residential area of Rayleigh than the other options, it is well located to the strategic highway network and has the potential to accommodate 'heavier' employment activities which are likely to become 'bad neighbours'. It has the potential to accommodate a significant proportion of employment land without impacting on residential amenity or the local highway network (highways access from this site may need to be negotiated carefully).

**North of London Southend Airport**

6.133 The Sustainability Appraisal of the area to the north of London Southend Airport for additional employment uses will be undertaken during the preparation of the London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan.

## **South of Great Wakering**

- 6.134 Although not situated in a strategic location in terms of accessibility, all of the options would ensure the retention of local employment opportunities and ensure the provision of good quality, flexible employment land to the east of the District. They have the potential to improve business development, help reduce social exclusion and sustain local services and facilities in the village. However, Options E20, E21, E23 and E24 would promote coalescence between the settlements of Great Wakering and Shoebury whereas Options E19 and E22 are less likely to. All of the options would impact on the openness of the Green Belt, although Options E19 and E22 to a lesser extent than the other options to the south of Great Wakering.
- 6.135 Option E19 proposes the smallest site of the six options, and is generally equal to that of the existing Star Lane Industrial Estate. However, Option E20 proposes a site more than double the capacity of the existing Star Lane Industrial Estate, whereas Option E21 is approximately a third bigger, Option E22 is nearly double and Option E24 is double the size. Option E23 on the other hand proposes an area nearly four times the capacity of the existing Star Lane Industrial Estate which would involve a significant increase in the quantum of employment land available in this location. All of the options with the exception of Option E19 would provide a surplus of employment land in the eastern area of the District, as opposed to the west of Rayleigh and north of London Southend Airport which are better related to the strategic road network as well as public transport routes. There is an existing bus route which could be enhanced to provide a sustainable alternative to the car to enable access, particularly to Options E19, E20 and E22. However, an overprovision of employment land in a non-strategic location is likely to be unsustainable and may have a negative impact on the local community through unnecessarily encroaching into the Green Belt in this location.
- 6.136 The relationship between residential development (on the reallocated Industrial Estate and Brickworks) and employment land with Options E19, E20 and E22 would need to be carefully considered. Although Option E21 is not adjacent to the existing Industrial Estate, the relationship between residential development to the east and employment land would need to be carefully considered. Options E23 and E24 are not well related to the existing residential areas of Great Wakering, as they bound the existing residential area of Shoebury, nevertheless the relationship between residential development and employment land with these options would still need to be carefully considered.
- 6.137 Options E19, E20, E21 and E22 are in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this Local Wildlife Site. It is recommended that a green buffer is provided to the north and/or east of Options E19, E20, E21 and E22, which may also provide an important wildlife corridor for the Local Wildlife Site to the north of these options, and along the perimeter of Options E23 and E24. Options E23 and E24 are not located in close proximity to areas designated for their ecological importance, although Option E23 does bound an area of parkland to the south which may have ecological value. The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the sites, if taken forward, in the future.

- 6.138 Options E20, E22, E23 and E24, as opposed to Option E19, have the potential to be detrimental to the local community and local economy, and are less likely to contribute to wider sustainability objectives. Options E23 and E24, and in particular Options E20 and E21, have the potential to erode the individual identities of Great Wakering and Shoebury. All of the options are situated near a proposed Greenway which extends into the Borough of Southend. It is recommended that any employment land designated to the south of Great Wakering should be small scale which should seek to meet the needs of the local community providing an accessible, sustainable and flexible employment site. It is not an appropriate location for a large strategic employment site. All of the options would have an impact on the local highway network, although existing employment land in the locality already has some impact, and proposals for appropriate employment use must have regard to potential future impact. None of the options may reduce the need to travel.
- 6.139 The options may have significant implications on the highway network at certain locations. Another road link could be provided to Star Lane for Option E21 and Poynters Lane for Option E22, but this would be on additional Green Belt land and may undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary. Furthermore the south of Great Wakering has links with the neighbouring economic centre of Southend; this relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.
- 6.140 All of the options are situated on grade 1 agricultural/greenfield land. Protection of agricultural land in the locality, however, needs to be balanced against the retention of local employment opportunities and the sustainability of the community. As opposed to Option E19, the other options would unnecessarily encroach further on to grade 1 agricultural land. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered. However, there are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to these options, and Great Wakering Conservation Area is situated to the north/north east.
- 6.141 Although Options E19 and E22 have the potential to make the creation of a defensible Green Belt boundary difficult, as opposed to some of the other options, they would still preserve the undeveloped area between Great Wakering and Shoebury to the south. The size of Option E19 is considered to be appropriate for this general location, and the eastern boundary of this option could be extended further to the east towards the defined field boundary and the southern boundary moved northwards. This would create a similar site arrangement as per Option E22 but with a site area akin to Option E19. Options E20, E21 and E23 would be able to create a defensible Green Belt boundary, however, it would encourage the coalescence between Great Wakering and Shoebury to the south, which would have a negative impact on the landscape character of the area. Option E24 on the other hand would weaken the Green Belt boundaries, undermine the openness of the Green Belt on a wider scale and would thus not ensure a defensible Green Belt boundary to prevent further encroachment. None of the options are within an area at risk of flooding, although there are areas of flood zone 2 and 3 to the north east and south east of this area. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Options E19 and E22 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared against the alternatives.
- (2) The general location to the south of Great Wakering is not considered to be an appropriate location for a large employment site – a smaller employment site to accommodate businesses displaced from the redevelopment of Star Lane Brickworks would be a more sustainable approach.
- (3) The size of Option E19 is considered to be appropriate for this general location, but the arrangement of the site may not facilitate a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary. It is recommended that the eastern boundary of Option E19, if taken forward, is extended further to the east towards the defined field boundary and the southern boundary is moved northwards. This would create a similar site arrangement as per Option E22 but with a site area akin to Option E19.
- (4) The options may have significant implications on the highway network at certain locations; therefore this impact would need to be considered.
- (5) Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered.
- (6) The relationship between residential development (on the reallocated Industrial Estate and Brickworks) and employment land within the recommended employment allocation (particularly with Options E19, E20 and E22) would need to be carefully considered.
- (7) Options E19 and E22 are in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this site.
- (8) It is recommended that a green buffer is provided to the north and/or east of Options E19, E20, E21 and E22 if taken forward.

**Environmental Allocations**

**Local Wildlife Sites**

- 6.142 The designation of Local Wildlife Sites would assist in the provision of quality opportunities for recreation and leisure and may enable access to locally important habitats, although it is recognised that not all designated Local Wildlife Sites are publicly accessible. This option would protect natural and semi-natural habitats which have local ecological value and also potentially conserve and enhance species diversity through the recognition of locally important wildlife habitats.
- 6.143 There is likely to be significant long-term positive effects for biodiversity through seeking to maintain, restore and enhance sites of nature conservation importance through the designation of such locally important sites. Green infrastructure links may also be provided in the future to facilitate species movement between sites.

6.144 The continued protection of these Local Wildlife Sites may have positive long-term effects through enhancing the quality of landscape areas, particularly to the east of the District. There may also be positive effects on the local climate through maintaining and enhancing local sites, which will assist in improving the resilience of sites in the face of climatic changes and potentially assist in maintaining and/or improving air quality within the District. This option may preserve soil quality. Furthermore there may be minor positive effects for the local economy through seeking to protect areas of nature conservation importance, which may support the local tourist industry.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) The option to allocate the 39 identified Local Wildlife Sites performs very strongly against the sustainability objectives.

**Upper Roach Valley**

- 6.145 The designation of this vast area would potentially have positive regeneration benefits for local communities and provide significant positive health effects through the creation of formal/informal recreational opportunities in proximity to residential areas, which would be accessible and inclusive and therefore benefit many in the local community.
- 6.146 There is potential to connect this 'green lung' to green infrastructure links/additional cycling routes, potentially providing additional health benefits, ensuring access for all sections of the community to this important local resource and encouraging alternative transport modes to the car.
- 6.147 Footpaths, bridleways and cycleways have the potential to increase the use of non-car modes of transport. It is recognised, however, that the site may encourage further access by private car. There may be minor positive effects for the local economy through seeking to protect areas of nature conservation importance, which may support the local tourist industry. There may also be minor positive effects through increased employment opportunities.
- 6.148 This option encompasses Hockley Woods which is a large expanse of woodland recognised for its ecological importance, land to the south which is a complex of ancient woodlands and farmland on undulating ground between Hockley and Southend-on-Sea, and Cherry Orchard Jubilee Country Park. This option would protect such natural and semi-natural habitats which form this important landscape. This option has the potential to conserve and enhance species diversity through recognising the importance of this area and preventing habitat fragmentation. The Core Strategy Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges that there is potential for very positive biodiversity effects, through enhancement of habitats and a potential longer term reduction in habitat fragmentation enabling flora and fauna to cope with the forecast effects of climate change.
- 6.149 This option has the potential to enhance the range and quality of the public realm and open spaces, through ensuring the continued protection of the important landscape between Hockley and Southend-on-Sea to the south. The continued protection of this important area would conserve the landscape character of this area. It would

potentially generate strong beneficial effects for improving landscape quality in the urban fringe and longer term beneficial effects for the preservation of soil quality and good agricultural land. Furthermore additional tree-planting is likely to increase the potential of the area to act as a 'carbon sink' and have positive benefits for air quality.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) The option to allocate the Upper Roach Valley performs very strongly against the sustainability objectives.

**Coastal Protection Belt**

- 6.150 The designation of the Coastal Protection Belt would have a positive effect on high quality, sustainable, healthy and safe communities by directing development away from coastal areas towards existing developed areas, which may also contribute to their regeneration. This option would potentially have indirect positive benefits for local economy.
- 6.151 It would help protect the wildlife and heritage qualities of the coastline, have positive long-term effects for biodiversity, have positive benefits for geological diversity and have a positive impact on soil quality.
- 6.152 By directing development away from the coast, there would be significant positive effects for the District's very distinctive coastal landscape. The Coastal Protection Belt encompasses numerous nature conservation designations and may therefore have positive long-term effects for biodiversity through seeking to maintain, restore and enhance sites of ecological importance through the designation of the District's distinctive landscape.
- 6.153 The Core Strategy Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal recognises that such a designation would assist in building resilience in an area particularly susceptible to the effects of climate change.
- 6.154 This option would ensure significant positive effects for the District's very distinctive coastal landscape, which encompasses numerous different historic environment character zones, and associated archaeological potential and sensitivity to change. This designation would continue to protect the character of the undeveloped coastline within the District. There is potential for positive long-term effects for water quality, particularly coastal water and for land and soil, through seeking to limit development in sensitive coastal areas. It would also direct development areas towards existing developed areas, which are generally at a lower risk of flooding.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) The option to allocate the Coastal Protection Belt performs very strongly against the sustainability objectives.

## **Education**

### **Site North of London Road Rayleigh**

6.155 The sustainability of allocating a single-form entry primary school to the north of London Road, Rayleigh depends on the specific site allocated for residential development. Please refer to the Sustainability Appraisals for residential development in this general location (Options NLR1 to NLR5).

### **Site to the West of Rochford**

6.156 The sustainability of allocating a new primary school to the west of Rochford depends on the specific site allocated for residential development. Please refer to the Sustainability Appraisals for residential development in this general location (Options WR1 to WR4).

### **King Edmund School**

- 6.157 All of the options would enable the phasing of infrastructure and the regeneration and enhancement of existing facilities through the provision of additional land to meet the ongoing and future needs of the community in terms of educational provision.
- 6.158 These options would have a positive impact on equal opportunities, qualifications and skills, and may ensure that all sections of the community may be catered.
- 6.159 Within all of the options, a proportion of the existing playing fields which are not required for expansion would retain their Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment. In effect a proportion of the existing playing fields, in addition to a new playing field would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt.
- 6.160 These options have the potential to provide additional playing field capacity which may improve health, ensure accessibility, reduce health inequalities, promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles, particularly if accessible to the local community.
- 6.161 Option KES1 would enable the expansion of the school to meet the needs of the community, as appropriate, and the additional land to the east could therefore provide additional playing field capacity for the school. This option would have a positive impact on the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities.
- 6.162 Options KES2 and KES3, however, may force potential residential development in the general location of East Ashingdon further to the north and may have an impact on the provision of improved access to the school from Brays Lane. All of the options, however, do have the potential to provide improved access, which may reduce the pressure on minor residential roads currently used for access.
- 6.163 Option KES1 should not be accessed from Oxford Road as it would not relate well to existing or additional school buildings (if provided on the current site). This is also a narrow residential road and the provision of access along this road would have a negative impact on community cohesion in this locality. Improved access should be provided from the north along Brays Lane.

- 6.164 All of the options are situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area, which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. Option KES1 would ensure that a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained in this locality. On the other hand Options KES2 and KES3 would have a negative impact on the landscape designation, defensibility of the Green Belt in the locality and subsequently local communities.
- 6.165 Option KES3 also has the potential to create an isolated area of residential development with the school situated between potential residential development and existing residential development.
- 6.166 However, these two options (Options KES2 and KES3) would enable additional educational capacity which is well related to the existing buildings, which would have a positive impact on the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities.
- 6.167 The existing playing field in Option KES1 would be extended further to the east beyond the existing residential area, whereas Options KES2 and KES3 would concentrate the school site to the north of Oxford Road.
- 6.168 The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain.
- 6.169 None of the options are in proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats.
- 6.170 Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) may be integrated into the development to mitigate the impact of expanding the capacity of the school on the local environment. The options are on grade 2 agricultural land but are not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance, and are in proximity to an area at risk of flooding.
- 6.171 The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered for all three options. There are Listed Buildings in the vicinity of Doggetts Farmhouse to the east of Option KES1 although these are not immediately adjacent to this site, and there are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to Options KES2 and KES3. The potential impact on any archaeological deposits would need to be considered with any development.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) All of the options perform strongly against the sustainability objectives, although Option KES2 and KES3 may force potential residential development in the general location of East Ashingdon further to the north and may have an impact on the provision of improved access to the school from Brays Lane.
- (2) A proportion of the existing playing fields which are not required for expansion would retain their Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment. In effect a proportion of the existing playing fields, in addition to new playing fields would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt.

- (3) Option KES1 should not be accessed from Oxford Road as it would not relate well to existing or additional school buildings (if provided on the current site). It is also a narrow residential road and the provision of access along this road would have a negative impact on community cohesion in this locality.
- (4) Improved access to the school should be provided from the north along Brays Lane.
- (5) The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered with any development.

### **Option EDU1 – Great Wakering**

- 6.172 This option to allocate Great Wakering Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities.
- 6.173 It would also, by helping ensure the retention of a local school, reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.174 This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities. The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within the village which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is potential to increase public transport provision in the locality.
- 6.175 This option is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. This option would ensure the future of this educational facility in the village, however, any further development to meet local needs would need to consider the impact on the historic environment. There are several Listed Buildings in proximity to this site along the High Street, and the Great Wakering Conservation Area is situated to the east/north east.
- 6.176 This facility is an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope.
- 6.177 The school site is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation as educational use would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, it already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside. In effect the existing playing fields would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding and it is situated on grade 1 agricultural land, however, it is not used as such.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU1 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside.

**Option EDU2 – Barling**

- 6.178 This option to allocate Barling Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. It would also reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.
- 6.179 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within the village which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is potential to increase public transport provision in the locality.
- 6.180 This option is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. It is acknowledged that this option is in proximity to the Coastal Protection Belt which is located to the north. However, the Coastal Protection Belt is a landscape quality designation rather than an indication of ecological value. The impact on the historic environment may need to be considered. There are two Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site.
- 6.181 This facility is an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope.
- 6.182 The school site is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation as educational use would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, it already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. In effect the existing playing fields would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. The developed part of the school site is situated within flood zone 2 and 3 and half the playing field is situated within flood zone 2. It is situated on grade 1 agricultural land, however, it is not used as such.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU2 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.

**Option EDU3 – Canewdon**

- 6.183 This option to allocate Canewdon Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within the village which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would help to ensure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.184 This option is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered. This site is in close proximity to the Canewdon High Street Conservation Area which encompasses numerous Listed Buildings.
- 6.185 This facility is an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope.
- 6.186 The school site is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation as educational use would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, it already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. In effect the existing playing fields would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding. It is situated on grade 3 agricultural land, however, it is not used as such.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU3 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.

### **Option EDU4 – Rochford**

- 6.187 This option to allocate four of the schools in Rochford for educational use would protect these existing facilities in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of these local primary schools, and enabling them to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.
- 6.188 The option would protect these existing facilities in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to these key educational facilities within Rochford, which are generally accessible by sustainable modes of travel. They can serve the local community and are generally in proximity to local bus routes. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of these schools and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.189 The majority of the schools identified within this option are not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance, although Waterman Primary is situated adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site. In any case, the formal designation of the existing playing field for educational use is unlikely to have an impact on the Local Wildlife Site, provided the school playing field retains its Green Belt allocation.
- 6.190 The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered. Rochford Primary School is situated within the Rochford Conservation Area. There are no Listed Buildings in immediate proximity to three of these facilities, although there are several in the vicinity of Rochford Primary School.
- 6.191 Three of the four schools in Rochford are situated within the residential envelope, however, Waterman Primary is situated in the Green Belt at present, thus an education designation would ensure that the schools can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. The facilities identified in this option are an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope. Although the allocation of these schools may ultimately result in a small loss of Green Belt land, the existing Waterman Primary already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. In effect the existing playing field for Waterman Primary would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt.
- 6.192 Although Rochford Primary School is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, there is an area of flood zone 2 to the south west and flood zone 2 and 3 to the south. The other three schools are not situated within a flood risk area. Furthermore whilst Waterman Primary is situated on grade 1 agricultural land, it is not used as such, and the other three schools are situated within the residential envelope.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU4 encompasses four existing educational facilities which perform strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field for Waterman Primary should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.

**Option EDU5 – King Edmund School (existing)**

- 6.193 This option to allocate the existing site of King Edmund School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local secondary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.
- 6.194 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within the built up area of Rochford/Ashingdon which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.195 This option is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered, and although there are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to the site, there are some Listed Buildings in the vicinity of Doggetts Farmhouse situated further to the south east of the site.
- 6.196 This facility is an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope.
- 6.197 The school site is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation for educational use in combination with one of the options (Options KES1, KES2 or KES3) would ensure the necessary capacity to expand the school to meet the needs of the local community. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, it already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, depending on the option taken forward, the existing or new playing field would retain a Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. In effect the school's playing field would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, and whilst it is situated on grade 2 agricultural land, it is not used as such.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU5 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing or new playing field would retain a Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. This would depend on the option taken forward for the expansion of King Edmund School (Options KES1, KES2 or KES3).

**Option EDU6 – Ashingdon**

- 6.198 This option to allocate Ashingdon Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.
- 6.199 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility to the north of Ashingdon. This site is accessible by a sustainable mode of travel given that it is in proximity to a local bus route. It can serve the local community although its relatively rural location may not discourage use of private transportation. There is potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.200 This option is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. Although the western third of the school site is situated within the Coastal Protection Belt, this is a landscape quality designation rather than an indication of ecological value. The existing school development already has some impact on the Coastal Protection Belt, and such impact is unlikely to materially change as a result of its formal allocation for educational use.
- 6.201 The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered, however, there are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site.
- 6.202 This facility is not situated on the fringe of the residential envelope.
- 6.203 The school site is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation for educational use would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, the existing development already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside. In effect the existing playing field would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding. The school is situated on grade 3 agricultural land, however, it is not used as such.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU6 is an existing educational facility which performs well against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside.

**Option EDU7 – Greensward Academy, Hockley**

- 6.204 This option to allocate Greensward Academy in Hockley for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local secondary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.
- 6.205 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within Hockley which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route and Hockley train station. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.206 This option is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. Extensive development in the locality over the last 50 years has significantly altered the historic environment, and there are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site. This facility is embedded within the existing residential envelope and thus this designation would have a nominal impact on the landscape character. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU7 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.

**Option EDU8 – The Westerings Primary School, Hawkwell**

- 6.207 This option to allocate Westerings Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.

- 6.208 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.209 This site is not in close proximity to the District's estuaries, or salt marshes. It is, however, adjacent to Hockley Woods to the west, which is an area of Ancient Woodland, a Site of Special Scientific Interest and a Local Nature Reserve, as well as a Local Wildlife Site to the south. In any case, the formal designation of the existing playing field for educational use is unlikely to have an impact on these designations, provided the school playing field retains its Green Belt allocation.
- 6.210 Although part of this site is also within the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area this is a landscape quality designation rather than an indication of ecological value. The existing school development's impact on the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area is not likely to significantly alter as a result of its formal allocation.
- 6.211 There may be some impact on local biodiversity although this is uncertain. The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered, however, there are no Listed Buildings in immediate proximity to this site.
- 6.212 This facility is an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope.
- 6.213 The school site is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation for educational use would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, it already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt and to protect the character of the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area. In effect the existing playing field would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, and it is situated on grade 3 agricultural land, although it is not used as such.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU8 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt and to protect the character of the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area.

#### **Option EDU9 – Hockley Primary School, Hockley**

- 6.214 This option to allocate Hockley Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the

capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.

- 6.215 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is, however, potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.216 This option is adjacent to two Local Wildlife Sites, one of which is an area of Ancient Woodland. There may be some impact on local biodiversity although this is uncertain. In any case, the formal designation of the existing playing field for educational use is unlikely to have an impact on these designations, provided the school playing field retains its Green Belt allocation.
- 6.217 The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered, however, there are no Listed Buildings in immediate proximity to this site.
- 6.218 This facility is an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope.
- 6.219 The school site is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation for educational use would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, it already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. In effect the existing playing field would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding. The school is situated on grade 3 agricultural land, however, it is not used as such.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU9 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.

**Option EDU10 – Riverside Junior and Infant School, Hullbridge**

- 6.220 This option to allocate Riverside Junior and Infant School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.

- 6.221 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within the village which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.222 This option is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. Although the school playing field is situated within the Coastal Protection Belt, this is a landscape quality designation rather than an indication of ecological value. In any case, the formal designation of the existing playing field for educational use is unlikely to have an impact on the Coastal Protection Belt, provided the playing field retains its Green Belt allocation. .
- 6.223 The impact on the historic environment would not likely to be significant. There are no Listed Buildings in immediate proximity to this site.
- 6.224 This facility is an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope.
- 6.225 The developed part of the school site is situated within the existing residential area. Its designation for educational use would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community. The school playing field is situated within the Green Belt at present. This existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt and to protect the character of the Coastal Protection Belt. In effect the existing playing fields would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding. The school playing field is situated on grade 3 agricultural land, however, it is not used as such. The rest of the school site is situated within the residential envelope.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU10 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt and to protect the character of the Coastal Protection Belt.

**Option EDU11 – St. Nicholas Church of England Primary School, Rayleigh**

- 6.226 This option to allocate St Nicholas Church of England Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.

- 6.227 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within Rayleigh which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.228 This option is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. In terms of the historic environment, the general area in which this facility is situated is largely developed so there is little sensitivity to change, and there are no Listed Buildings in immediate proximity to this site. The school site is entirely situated within the existing residential area, thus this designation would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU11 is an existing educational facility which performs well against the sustainability objectives.

**Option EDU12 – Our Lady of Ransom Primary School, Rayleigh (A)**

- 6.229 This option to allocate Our Lady of Ransom Primary School in Rayleigh for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.
- 6.230 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within the Rayleigh which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.231 This option is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. This option is unlikely to have a significant impact on the historic environment, and it is not in immediate proximity to any Listed Buildings.
- 6.232 This facility is an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope.

6.233 The school site is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation for educational use would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, it already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. In effect the existing playing field would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding. The school is situated on grade 3 agricultural land, however, it is not used as such.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU12 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.

**Option EDU13 – Sweyne Park School, Glebe Junior School (B)**

6.234 This option to allocate Sweyne Park School and Glebe Junior School for educational use would protect these existing facilities in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school and secondary school, and enabling them to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.

6.235 The option would protect these existing facilities in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to these key educational facilities within Rayleigh which are accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that they can serve the local community and are in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of these schools and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.

6.236 These schools are not located in immediate proximity to any areas of ecological importance. In terms of the historic environment, the general area in which these facilities are situated is largely developed so there is little sensitivity to change, and they are not situated in immediate proximity to any Listed Buildings. The schools are entirely situated within the existing residential area, thus this designation would ensure that these schools can meet the future needs of the community. This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU13 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.

### **Option EDU14 – Down Hall Primary School (C)**

- 6.237 This option to allocate Down Hall Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.
- 6.238 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within Rayleigh which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.239 This school is not located in immediate proximity to any areas of ecological importance. In terms of the historic environment, the general area is largely developed so there is little sensitivity to change and this school is not in immediate proximity to any Listed Buildings. The school is entirely situated within the existing residential area, thus this designation would ensure that this school can meet the future needs of the community. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU14 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.

### **Option EDU15 – Edward Francis Junior and Infant School (A)**

- 6.240 This option to allocate Edward Francis Junior and Infant School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.
- 6.241 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within Rayleigh which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.

6.242 This school is not located in immediate proximity to any areas of ecological importance. In terms of the historic environment, the general area is largely developed so there is little sensitivity to change, and this school is not in immediate proximity to any Listed Buildings. The school is entirely situated within the existing residential area, thus this designation would ensure that this school can meet the future needs of the community. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU15 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.

**Option EDU16 – Fitzwimarc Secondary School (B)**

6.243 This option to allocate Fitzwimarc Secondary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local secondary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.

6.244 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within Rayleigh which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.

6.245 This school is not located in immediate proximity to any areas of ecological importance. In terms of the historic environment, the general area is largely developed so there is little sensitivity to change, however, there is a Grade II Listed Building in proximity to the south west corner of the site. Future development on this part of the option would have to consider any impact on this Listed Building, but the allocation of the existing school site for educational purposes would not be intrinsically harmful to the character or setting of the Listed Building.

6.246 The school is entirely situated within the existing residential area, thus this designation would ensure that it can meet the future needs of the community. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU16 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.

### **Option EDU17 – Wyburns Primary School**

- 6.247 This option to allocate Wyburns Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.
- 6.248 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within Rayleigh which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.249 This school is not located in immediate proximity to any areas of ecological importance. In terms of the historic environment, the general area is largely developed so there is little sensitivity to change, and there are no Listed Buildings in immediate proximity to this site.
- 6.250 This facility is an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope.
- 6.251 The school site is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation for educational use would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, it already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. In effect the existing playing field would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. Furthermore there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 which runs along the northern boundary of the school site, and although it is situated on grade 3 agricultural land, it is not used as such.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU17 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.

### **Option EDU18 – Grove Wood Primary School, Rayleigh**

- 6.252 This option to allocate Grove Wood Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local

communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.

- 6.253 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within Rayleigh which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.254 This school is not in close proximity to the District's estuaries, or salt marshes, however, it is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site. There may be some impact on local biodiversity although this is uncertain. In any case, the formal designation of the existing playing field for educational use is unlikely to have an impact on the Local Wildlife Site, provided the school playing field retains its Green Belt allocation.
- 6.255 In terms of the historic environment, the general area is largely developed so there is little sensitivity to change, and it is not in immediate proximity to any Listed Buildings.
- 6.256 This facility is an appropriate use on the fringe of the residential envelope.
- 6.257 The school site is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation for educational use would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, it already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. In effect the existing playing field would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. Furthermore it is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, and although the school is situated on grade 3 agricultural land, it is not used as such.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option EDU18 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.

#### **Option EDU19 – Stambridge Primary School**

- 6.258 This option to allocate Stambridge Primary School for educational use would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that educational facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. This designation would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through helping to ensure the future of this local primary school, and enabling it to adapt as appropriate to meet the needs of local communities.

- 6.259 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' educational needs are catered for. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to this key educational facility within Stambridge which is accessible by sustainable modes of travel given that it can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would likely secure the future of this school and thus reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend.
- 6.260 This school is not located in immediate proximity to any areas of ecological importance, and although it is situated within the Coastal Protection Belt and partly with the Crouch/Roach Marshes Special Landscape Area, these are landscape quality designations rather than an indication of ecological value. In any case, the formal designation of the existing playing field for educational use is unlikely to have an impact on the Coastal Protection Belt and the Special Landscape Area, provided the playing field retains its Green Belt allocation. The River Roach which has ecological value is situated further to the south of this school.
- 6.261 The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered, and there is also a Grade II\* Listed Building immediately to the south of the school site.
- 6.262 The school site is not on the fringe of the residential envelope, but is entirely situated within the Green Belt at present. Its designation would ensure that the school can meet the future needs of the community, as appropriate. Although the allocation of the school may ultimately result in a loss of Green Belt land, it already has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside. In effect the existing playing fields would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, and although it is situated on grade 1 agricultural land, it is not used as such.

### *Recommendations*

- (1) Option EDU19 is an existing educational facility which performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside.

### **Open Space**

- 6.263 Option OS1 would ensure the retention of identified areas of existing public open space; however, those areas identified do not represent all the areas of open space in the District as identified in the Open Space Study 2009 which are currently publicly accessible. The allocation of some areas of open space within this option has the potential to have a negative impact on meeting the ongoing and future needs of local communities as those which are excluded may not have the same level of recognition and protection through the planning system. All of the identified areas should be included. On the other hand, if public open space is not designated as advocated by

Option OS2 then this may not ensure the future protection of these important areas from other uses and would therefore not positively contribute to reducing social exclusion, or to balanced, healthy and safe communities.

- 6.264 Allocating areas of public open space in Option OS1 would have a positive impact on existing communities through providing accessible and quality facilities for leisure and recreation in proximity to local communities, and would protect these existing facilities from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' leisure and recreational needs are catered for. Option OS2, however, would not.
- 6.265 The protection of the District's existing open spaces (Option OS1), particularly those which have a multi-functional use will provide health benefits for local communities and also contribute to local biodiversity through providing habitats for wildlife. It would positively contribute to healthy and safe communities and to reducing social exclusion, however, Option OS2 may have a negative impact on health, health inequalities, informal recreation and healthy, active lifestyles. Option OS1 may encourage alternative modes of travel such as walking and cycling, potentially reducing the need to travel and ensure access to these local facilities, whereas Option OS2 would likely have a negative impact on accessibility.
- 6.266 Option OS1 has the potential to conserve and enhance natural/semi-natural habitats and conserve and enhance species diversity, however, the ecological value of each area of open space is likely to differ given the varying nature of the sites and recreational pressures. Not allocating areas of public open space in Option OS2, however, may mean that natural/semi-natural habitats and species diversity are not conserved or enhanced. Furthermore some of the identified areas of open space are designated for their nature conservation importance, but other areas do not have this protection and so if they are not designated as in Option OS2 then they would be afforded less recognition and protection through the planning process.
- 6.267 Option OS1 has the potential to protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in both urban and rural areas, whereas Option OS2 may not. Option OS1 has the potential to conserve the different landscape characters of the District at a local level, positively contribute to the ability of the local area to adapt to the consequences of climate change, and reduce the risk of localised flooding. It also has the potential to preserve local soil quality, and have a positive impact on local air quality. Option OS2 on the other hand may not.

#### *Recommendations Key Observations*

- (1) Option OS1 to allocate existing areas of public open space performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) All areas of public open space as identified in the Open Space Study 2009 should be included within the open space designation.

## **Leisure Facilities**

### **Option LF1 – Rayleigh Leisure Centre**

- 6.268 The allocation of Rayleigh Leisure Centre for leisure uses would secure its future and ensure that this leisure facility can meet the ongoing and future needs of the local community. This option may have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities, and would positively contribute to healthy communities. It may promote community cohesion and social inclusion through protecting this community facility, and securing its future so that it has the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the needs of the local community in terms of leisure facilities. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to Rayleigh Leisure Centre which is generally accessible by sustainable modes of travel. It can serve the local community and there is potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to use its facilities.
- 6.269 This general location is not located in immediate proximity to any areas of ecological importance. In terms of the historic environment, the general area is largely developed so there is little sensitivity to change, and there are no Listed Buildings in immediate proximity to this option. It is entirely situated within the existing residential area, thus this designation would ensure that this facility can meet the future needs of the community. It is also not situated within an area at risk of flooding. However, Rawreth Industrial Estate situated to the west of the site is designated an AQMA.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option LF1 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- 6.270 It is noted that the playing pitches to the rear of Rayleigh Leisure Centre have now been completed. Therefore it is recommended that these are included within the designated area of Rayleigh Leisure Centre to ensure that these are protected through the planning process.

### **Option LF2 – Clements Hall Leisure Centre**

- 6.271 The allocation of Clements Hall Leisure Centre for leisure uses would secure its future and ensure that this leisure facility can meet the ongoing and future needs of the local community. At present it is situated within the Green Belt and retaining this designation at this site has the potential to restrict the future development of this facility and thus its ability to meet local needs. The southern developed part of the site, however, which encompasses the building and car park areas may be designated as leisure use. Deallocating this part of the site from the Green Belt would effectively result in a loss of Green Belt in the locality. Nevertheless it would ensure that this facility which is situated on the urban fringe can expand as appropriate to meet the leisure needs of the local community. The existing playing field would retain its Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment. In effect the existing playing field would have a dual designation of leisure use and Green Belt. The loss of developed Green Belt land should be weighed against the need for such facilities to continue to meet the ongoing and future needs of the local community.

- 6.272 This option may have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities. It may promote community cohesion and social inclusion through protecting this community facility, and securing its future. Deallocation of the developed part of the site so that it has the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the needs of the local community would need to be carefully considered. The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' leisure needs are catered for. It would positively contribute to healthy communities.
- 6.273 This allocation would ensure sustainable access to Clements Hall Leisure Centre which is generally accessible by sustainable modes of travel. It can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality. This option would reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to use its facilities.
- 6.274 This general location is not located in immediate proximity to any areas of ecological importance. The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered, and there is also a Grade II Listed Building situated to the north of the site. At present the leisure centre is situated within the Green Belt, on the urban fringe, and retaining this designation at this site has the potential to restrict the future development of this facility and thus its ability to meet local needs. The leisure centre building and land to the south and south east are situated within flood zone 2 and 3, and although it is situated on grade 3 agricultural land, it is not used as such.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option LF2 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and leisure use to prevent unnecessary encroachment.

**Option LF3 – Great Wakering Leisure Centre**

- 6.275 The allocation of Great Wakering Leisure Centre for leisure uses would secure its future and ensure that this leisure facility can meet the ongoing and future needs of the local community. This facility is not situated within the Green Belt. This option may have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities. It may promote community cohesion and social inclusion through protecting this community facility, and securing its future so that it has the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the needs of the local community.
- 6.276 The option would protect this existing facility in the locality from other uses thereby ensuring that the local communities' leisure needs are catered for, and would positively contribute to healthy communities. This allocation would ensure sustainable access to Great Wakering Leisure Centre which is generally accessible by sustainable modes of travel. It can serve the local community and is in proximity to a local bus route. There is also potential to increase public transport provision in the locality and reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to use its facilities.

6.277 This general location is not located in immediate proximity to any areas of ecological importance. The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered, and there is a Grade II Listed Building in close proximity to this option. The leisure centre is not situated within the existing residential area or the Green Belt, thus this designation would ensure that this facility can meet the future needs of the community. Great Wakering Leisure Centre is not situated within an area at risk of flooding. There is, however, an area of flood zone 2 to the north east. The leisure centre is situated on grade 1 agricultural land, however, it is not used as such.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option LF3 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.

6.278 Great Wakering Leisure Centre became unviable to run and was closed in October 2011. It may therefore not be appropriate to allocate Option LF3 for leisure use. This site, which encompasses both the leisure centre and the playing field, may retain its existing public open space designation. However, the allocation of the existing developed part of the site may need to be reviewed in light of these recent changes.

#### **Community Facilities**

6.279 The option to designate existing community facilities for community use (Option CF1) would protect such facilities from other uses thus promoting community cohesion and social inclusion, and providing future confidence so that these facilities have the capacity to expand as appropriate to meet the needs of communities. On the other hand Option CF2 may not positively contribute to balanced, healthy and safe communities through not safeguarding these facilities.

6.280 Option CF1 would have a positive impact on, and contribute to the regeneration and enhancement of, existing and future communities through protecting these existing facilities from other uses, and ensuring that the local communities' needs in terms of community facilities are catered for, whereas Option CF2 may not. Also Option CF2 may have a negative impact on health, health inequalities, informal recreation and healthy, active lifestyles. However, it may not be practical to identify and allocate all buildings/structures in community use, as there is potential that some facilities could be missed, or despite being of importance, are too small to warrant a land-use allocation. In this case, there should be a general policy supporting the retention of all community facilities, and it is noted that Policy CLT6 of the Core Strategy would provide overarching protection for all community facilities in the District.

6.281 Option CF1 would have a positive impact on accessibility as the facilities are located in proximity to local communities, which would potentially reduce the need to travel and encourage sustainable modes of travel, although this depends on the alternative modes of transport available in each locality. This option would enable access for all sections of the community and ensure sustainable access to these key facilities. Although to not allocate them as advocated in Option CF2 may not safeguard them from other uses, Policy CLT6 of the Core Strategy would provide overarching protection for all community facilities in the District.

- 6.282 The different community facilities identified in Option CF1 are within varying proximity to areas of nature conservation importance and landscape designations, however, the majority of facilities are not situated in immediate proximity to areas of ecological importance. Due to the dispersed nature of the identified community facilities, there is likely to be a varied impact on the historic environment. Furthermore one facility is situated within Rayleigh Conservation Area, and three other facilities are situated within Rochford Conservation Area. Conversely, if the identified community facilities are not safeguarded for the future (Option CF2) then the historic environment may be less protected, however, sufficient protection would be provided through the Core Strategy.
- 6.283 Many of the identified facilities in Option CF1 are situated within the existing residential area, however, three are situated within the Green Belt. Therefore deallocating these sites from the Green Belt would effectively result in a loss of Green Belt in the locality. The loss of developed Green Belt land would need to be weighed against the need for such facilities to continue to meet the ongoing and future needs of the local community. On the other hand, as Option CF2 may not safeguard the identified community facilities, the different landscape characters may not be conserved at a local level. However, sufficient protection would be provided through the Core Strategy.
- 6.284 The majority are not situated in an area at risk of flooding, although the northern section of one facility is situated within flood zone 2 and 3. Although some of the facilities are on grade 3 agricultural land and one is located on grade 1 agricultural land, they are not used as such.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Whilst there would be benefits to allocating community facilities for community use, it is not considered to be practical to identify and allocate all buildings/structures in community use, as there is potential that some facilities could be missed, or despite being of importance, are too small to warrant a land-use allocation.
- (2) The approach of allocating existing community facilities for community use, as set out in Option CF1, performs well against sustainability objectives.
- (3) A general policy supporting the retention of all community facilities would also be a sustainable approach. It is noted that Policy CLT6 of the Core Strategy Submission Document would provide overarching protection for all community facilities in the District.

### **Town Centres**

#### **Rayleigh – Town Centre Boundary**

- 6.285 Options TC1 and TC2 would promote and enhance the existing centre of Rayleigh and ensure a mix of town centre uses, however, Option TC2 would concentrate these within a significantly smaller area than Option TC1. Option TC1 has the potential to have a positive impact on the regeneration and enhancement of the urban communities, sustainable access to key services, equal opportunities and that all

sections of the community are catered for through encouraging a mix of uses within a wide area, whereas Option TC2 may have a less positive impact. Option TC1 may also promote informal recreation, improve health and reduce health inequalities, but this may be less for Option TC2 as uses would be concentrated over a much smaller area than at present.

- 6.286 Retaining the existing town centre boundary in Option TC1 would have a positive impact on the proportion, tenure and affordability of housing provided within the existing urban area through encouraging high density development appropriate to a town centre location. This would also potentially preserve greenfield sites elsewhere in the District which may be of more ecological value than brownfield land in the town centre. However, the potential positive impact of Option TC2, particularly in terms of preserving greenfield land/agricultural land, would be lessened as high density development would be encouraged over a smaller area. Furthermore Option TC1 encompasses much derelict, degraded or underused land in the town centre, although in Option TC2 this is to a lesser extent. Option TC1 would therefore have a greater positive impact on previously developed land.
- 6.287 It is important that the town centre boundary is drawn wide enough ensure the vitality and vibrancy of Rayleigh. The restricted extent of Option TC2 may not be appropriate for the size of Rayleigh, as it has the potential to force businesses/uses out of the town, which may have a negative impact on business development. Option TC1 would potentially reduce energy consumption through balancing the supply and demand of town centre uses, whereas Option TC2 may not. Option TC1 would also ensure access to services for those without access to private transport through providing a concentration of services and sustainable transport modes in a central location, whereas Option TC2 would ensure access over a much smaller area. As such Option TC1 has the potential to reduce the need to travel for some, which may have a positive impact on local air quality, whereas Option TC2 may not. There is also a recognised issue with air quality within the town centre and monitoring is ongoing in the area.
- 6.288 In terms of the historic environment, both town centre boundaries are encompassed by much of the Rayleigh Conservation Area and there are numerous Listed Buildings in the area. Both options would preserve the existing townscape character, as they are encompassed by much of the Rayleigh Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character, although Option TC2 encompasses a smaller area. Neither option is situated within a flood risk area.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) The existing town centre boundary in Option TC1 performs more strongly against the sustainability objectives than the smaller area identified in Option TC2.
- (2) The Rayleigh town centre boundary may be reviewed through the development of the Rayleigh Area Action Plan. The sustainability of any revised town centre boundary would have to be considered in conjunction with other proposals within the Area Action Plan.

## **Rochford – Town Centre Boundary**

- 6.289 All of the options would promote and enhance Rochford town centre. Options TC4, TC5 and TC6 encompass less residential development than Option TC3 (the present town centre boundary). Options TC4 and TC5 could encourage an appropriate mix of uses and promote high density development within a core area, and ensure access to services, thus positively impacting on balanced communities, energy consumption, health, health inequalities and informal recreation.
- 6.290 Option TC3, however, may be too widely drawn which could dilute the retail focus, disperse businesses, and negatively impact on the vitality and vibrancy of the town, health and health inequalities, and energy consumption and equal opportunities in terms of access to services and facilities. On the other hand Option TC6, which does not encompass new retail development to the north of the Market Square, like Options TC4 and TC5 could promote mixed, high density development, and ensure access. However, it may be drawn too small which could potentially force out viable businesses/uses, discourage development on previously developed land, and impact on accessibility, energy consumption, social inclusion, health and opportunities for informal recreation. Options TC3 and TC6 may therefore not meet local needs.
- 6.291 Option TC3 would ensure that a greater proportion, tenure and affordability of housing can be provided within the existing urban area through encouraging high density development appropriate to a town centre location than Options TC4, TC5 and in particular TC6. This option would also potentially have a greater positive impact on the preservation of greenfield sites elsewhere in the District, which may be of more ecological value than brownfield land in the town centre, than the other options. Whilst Rochford town centre contains numerous Listed Buildings which may, to a certain extent, limit opportunities for high density residential development within this central area, potential opportunity sites have been identified through initial work of the Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan.
- 6.292 There is an existing bus route running through the town centre and Rochford train station is accessible to the west/south west. There is potential to improve public transport provision in the locality. The options have the potential to provide access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre. However, Options TC4 and TC5 have the potential to reduce the need to travel for some in the locality, whereas Options TC3 and TC6 may not.
- 6.293 All of the options would preserve the existing townscape character, and are encompassed by Rochford Conservation Area, which seeks to protect the local character and contains numerous Listed Buildings. The historic environment is highly sensitive to change. Option TC3 has the potential to promote the re-use of derelict, degraded or underutilised land within the town centre, whereas Options TC4, TC5 and TC6 may not. However, there is potential for Option TC5 to be extended northwards, westwards and southwards to encompass potential opportunity sites. None of the options are situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area to the west/south west. There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Whilst the options generally perform well against the sustainability objectives, Option TC5 performs more strongly in terms of the potential to promote mixed, high density residential development within Rochford and ensuring access to services without being too widely drawn (like Option TC3 and TC4) or not wide enough (Option TC6).
- (2) Whilst Option TC5 encompasses much less residential development than the existing town centre boundary (Option TC3) and includes the new retail development to the north of the Market Square, it does not include some potentially key opportunity sites for redevelopment.
- (3) The boundary defined in Option TC5 could be extended northwards along North Street towards Weir Pond Road to include potential redevelopment sites in this area.
- (4) The boundary defined in Option TC5 could be extended westwards along West Street and southwards along South Street towards Bradley Way to include the area encompassing Locks Hill, the health centre facilities and Back Lane car park.
- (5) The Rochford town centre boundary may be reviewed through the development of the Rochford Area Action Plan. The sustainability of any revised town centre boundary would have to be considered in conjunction with other proposals within the Area Action Plan.

**Hockley – Town Centre Boundary**

6.294 All of the options encompass the core retail development within the existing central area of Hockley. Options TC7 and TC8 would continue to focus retail and other appropriate uses which would ensure that the ongoing and future needs of local communities can be met, although Option TC8 does not extend as far west along Main Road. These options would potentially ensure the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities. However, Option TC9 also encompasses the Eldon Way and Foundry Industrial Estates, which has the potential to disperse the retail focus, impact on the vitality and vibrancy of Hockley centre, and may not meet the ongoing and future needs of local communities. All of the options would ensure a mix of uses and appropriate densities of residential development over the central area, although within Option TC9 these may be dispersed which could impact on equal opportunities.

6.295 The options have the potential to improve health, reduce health inequalities and promote informal recreation through a mix of uses, including leisure uses. Options TC7 and TC8 would ensure that a greater proportion, tenure and affordability of housing can be provided within the existing urban area through encouraging high density development appropriate to a town centre location. This would also potentially preserve greenfield sites/agricultural land elsewhere in the District which may be of more ecological value than brownfield land in the centre. Option TC8 encompasses a smaller area than Option TC7. Option TC9 would also have a positive impact in terms of promoting development of underused previously developed in preference to greenfield sites, although any redevelopment of the industrial estates would be

determined through the Hockley Area Action Plan. Options TC7 and TC8 include some potential opportunity sites, whereas Option TC9 encompasses the majority of sites, identified in initial work for the Hockley Area Action Plan for improvement and derelict or underused land available. Any residential development within the centre of Hockley and a concentration of retail and other services would ensure sustainable access to key services (although such uses would be more dispersed in Option TC9). This may have a positive impact on local air quality.

- 6.296 If the boundary is drawn too small, this would potentially force out viable businesses/uses, whereas if the boundary was drawn too big then this would potentially disperse businesses/uses over an unnecessarily large area thus potentially impacting on the vitality and vibrancy of the town. Option TC9 may be too widely drawn based on the current uses within Hockley centre, in that it encompasses employment land to the north of Spa Road. There are existing bus routes running through the centre and Hockley train station is accessible to the north east of all three options. The options have the potential to reduce the need to travel for some in the locality, and there is also potential to improve public transport provision.
- 6.297 In terms of the historic environment, there are no Listed Buildings within the boundaries of Options TC7, TC8 or TC9, although it is noted that there is a Grade II Listed Building situated to the east of Hockley centre. Options TC7 and TC8 are generally appropriate in size to accommodate retail and other appropriate uses, and have the potential to reduce energy consumption through balancing the supply and demand of such uses. Option TC9, however, may be too widely drawn, which may have a negative impact on energy consumption and accessibility. None of the options are situated within an area at risk of flooding.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option TC8, which encompasses a slightly smaller area than existing, performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) This boundary may be reviewed through the development of the Hockley Area Action Plan. The sustainability of any revised town centre boundary would have to be considered in conjunction with other proposals within the Area Action Plan.

#### **Option TC10 – Reallocation of Hockley as a District Centre**

- 6.298 Reallocating Hockley from a town centre to a district centre may limit opportunities for community facilities to meet ongoing and future needs in the centre of Hockley, and negatively impact on the viability and vitality of Hockley. It may undermine the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities through restricting potential opportunities for development and improvement where appropriate. However, any redevelopment of Hockley centre will be determined through the Hockley Area Action Plan, and design of any development would be determined through the development management process. This option may not encourage a suitable mix of uses and development may be directed away from Hockley centre thus undermining its vitality. This therefore has the potential to have a negative impact on equal opportunities, accessibility, health, consumer choice, social inclusion and opportunities for informal recreation within the centre. It may also mean that local people have to rely more on

the private car to access services and facilities in other areas of the District. It may therefore not reduce the need to travel, and have a negative impact on energy consumption and local air quality.

- 6.299 Appropriately dense residential development within this accessible, sustainable location would not be viable given its deallocation as a town centre, therefore it potentially would not safeguard other greenfield sites/agricultural land in the District which may be of more ecological value. This option may discourage the reuse of derelict, degraded or underused land. The deallocation of Hockley also has the potential to negatively impact on the range and affordability of housing within this sustainable location.
- 6.300 Hockley centre is accessible by sustainable modes of travel as there are bus routes through the centre and the train station is accessible to the north east. There is also potential to improve public transport provision in the locality. This option has the potential to discourage development where large volumes of people and/or transport movements are located. If the centre were to no longer be allocated as a town centre, development would be directed to other centres, which may reduce demand for provision of public transport services to Hockley centre.
- 6.301 In terms of the historic environment it is probable that the development of Hockley in the post war period has had a severe adverse impact on any archaeological deposits, and there are no Listed Buildings within the existing Hockley centre boundary, although it is noted that there is a Grade II Listed Building situated to the east of the centre. This option may limit opportunities for enhancing local character and amenity, but conversely could help preserve the character of Hockley centre by discouraging new development in the centre.
- 6.302 Hockley centre is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, and air quality is not an issue.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) The option to reallocate Hockley as a District Centre does not perform well against the sustainability objectives, as retail and other business opportunities may be directed to Rayleigh and Rochford town centres which would have a significant negative impact against a range of sustainability objectives.

### **Primary Shopping Areas**

#### **Rayleigh – Primary Shopping Area**

- 6.303 Option TC11 encompasses the existing primary shopping frontage area and would continue to focus retail development within the existing centre whilst enhancing consumer choice outside this core area.
- 6.304 Option TC12 on the other hand encompasses the existing primary and secondary shopping frontages for Rayleigh, which has the potential to dilute the existing concentration of core retail uses and have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre. This option could have a negative impact on consumer choice, sustainable access, energy consumption, regeneration and equal opportunities given the dispersal of primary activities.

- 6.305 Concentrating primary uses within Option TC11 would have a positive impact on regeneration, the mix of uses, sustainable access, energy consumption, consumer choice and equal opportunities.
- 6.306 Both options would promote high density residential development, enhance natural surveillance throughout the day and potentially preserve other greenfield sites/agricultural land outside the existing residential envelope. If the primary shopping area is drawn too widely then this has the potential to dilute the retail focus which may therefore have a negative impact on business development. It could lead to an increase in retail floorspace even if there is no demand and reduce the appeal and vibrancy of the town centre. The Retail and Leisure Study (2008) suggests that no changes should be made to the boundaries of Rayleigh, therefore it may be more appropriate to exclude the secondary shopping frontages which are less associated with, and extend further away from, the primary shopping frontage, for example towards the southern end of the High Street.
- 6.307 The proposed primary shopping areas are in an accessible location which may encourage access for all sections of the community and encourage alternative modes of transportation. The dispersal of uses within Option TC12 may however reduce accessibility for some, may not reduce the need to travel and could impact on local air quality. Both options are encompassed by Rayleigh Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment, and there are numerous Listed Buildings within this area. Both options also include underutilised land in the vicinity of the High Street which has been identified in initial work for the Rayleigh Town Centre Area Action Plan as having potential for improvement. The defined areas are not situated within an area at risk of flooding. However, there is a recognised issue with air quality within Rayleigh town centre and monitoring is ongoing in the area.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) The Primary Shopping Area defined within Option TC11 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives. This area is smaller than the town centre boundary for Rayleigh (Option TC1), which performed better against sustainability objectives than Option TC2.
- (2) The area outside the defined Primary Shopping Area but within the defined town centre boundary should encompass a mix of appropriate town centre (retail and non-retail) uses to complement those within the Primary Shopping Area.

#### **Rochford – Primary Shopping Area**

- 6.308 Option TC13 encompasses the existing primary shopping frontage area and would maintain the concentration of retail uses around this core area with appropriate non-retail uses residing within the rest of the town centre boundary (depending on the future designated boundary). This option would have a positive impact on regeneration, the mix of uses, consumer choice, sustainable access, local air quality, social exclusion, energy consumption and equal opportunities. It may reduce the need to travel.

- 6.309 Option TC14, however, encompasses the existing primary and secondary shopping frontages, and has the potential to dilute retail uses and create an overabundance of retail uses thereby restricting the presence of other non-retail, complementary uses which could impact on the vitality and vibrancy of the town centre. This option may have a negative impact on regeneration, equal opportunities, sustainable access, and social exclusion.
- 6.310 Neither option includes the new retail development to the north of the Market Square.
- 6.311 Both options would promote high density residential development (although there are numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford), enhance natural surveillance throughout the day and potentially preserve other greenfield sites/agricultural land outside the existing residential envelope. If the boundary of the primary shopping area is drawn too widely then this has the potential to dilute the retail focus which may therefore have a negative impact on business development.
- 6.312 Option TC14 would encompass a large proportion of the options for two of the options for the town centre allocation itself (Options TC5 and TC6). If Options TC14 were to be taken forward in conjunction with either Option TC5 or TC6, there would be limited town centre space remaining to accommodate non-retail, appropriate uses. This would undermine town centre vitality and vibrancy, as well as stifling economic development potential.
- 6.313 Both options would encourage provision of public transport to and from the centre. The dispersal of uses within Option TC14 may however reduce accessibility for some, may not reduce the need to travel and could impact on local air quality. They are both encompassed by the Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment, and there are numerous Listed Buildings within this area.
- 6.314 Neither option includes previously developed land which have been identified in initial work for the Rochford Area Action Plan as having potential for improvement. The options are not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 in immediate proximity to the west/south west.
- 6.315 There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) The Primary Shopping Area defined within Option TC13 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives. This area is smaller than the town centre boundary for Rochford (Option TC5 with minor amendments) which performed better than Options TC3, TC4 and TC6.
- (2) The area outside the defined Primary Shopping Area but within the defined town centre boundary should encompass a mix of appropriate town centre (retail and non-retail) uses to complement those within the Primary Shopping Area.

### **Hockley – Primary Shopping Area**

- 6.316 Option TC15 encompasses the existing primary shopping frontage, and continuing to focus retail development within this core area would maintain the concentration of such uses with appropriate non-retail uses residing outside this area (depending on the future designated boundary). This option would have a positive impact on the mix of uses, regeneration, consumer choice, equal opportunities, local air quality, sustainable access, energy consumption and social inclusion.
- 6.317 Option TC16 on the other hand encompasses the existing primary and secondary shopping frontages, and has the potential to dilute the existing concentration of retail uses along the Spa Road which would have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of Hockley centre. This option may have a negative impact on regeneration, equal opportunities, energy consumption, local air quality, sustainable access, and social inclusion.
- 6.318 Both options would promote high density residential development, enhance natural surveillance throughout the day and potentially preserve other greenfield sites/agricultural land outside the existing residential envelope.
- 6.319 Option TC16 proposes an extension away from the central area which may impinge on the accessibility of essential facilities and potentially reduce the quantum of non-retail uses through encouraging a greater proportion of retail uses over a wider area. This could lead to an increase in retail floorspace even if there is no demand and reduce the appeal and vibrancy of Hockley. Furthermore the Retail and Leisure Study (2008) suggests that if Hockley was to increase its retail offer then it would meet the requirements of a town centre in PPS6.
- 6.320 Both options would preserve and potentially support the provision of public transport to the centre. In terms of the historic environment, there are no Listed Buildings within either boundary, although it is noted that there is a Grade II Listed Building situated to the east of the centre. Both options encompass some potential opportunity sites within the central area of Hockley, however, any future development will be determined through the Hockley Area Action Plan. Neither option is situated within an area at risk of flooding. Air quality is not an issue within the centre of Hockley.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) The Primary Shopping Area defined within Option TC15 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives. This area is smaller than the town centre boundary for Hockley (Option TC8) which performed better than Options TC7 and TC9.
- (2) The area outside the defined Primary Shopping Area but within the defined town centre boundary should encompass a mix of appropriate town centre (retail and non-retail) uses to complement those within the Primary Shopping Area.

## **Alternative Options**

### **Option ALT1 – Nevendon Salvage, Lower Road, Hullbridge**

- 6.321 This option is a potential alternative to other South West Hullbridge residential allocation options.
- 6.322 This option is situated to the south east of Hullbridge which does not accord with the strategic approach outlined in the Core Strategy Submission Document.
- 6.323 This option is previously developed land situated in the Green Belt which is currently in use and, although not well related to local services and facilities when compared to alternatives, the existing bus service could have a positive impact on equal opportunities in terms of access.
- 6.324 However, it could have a negative impact on balanced communities as the relatively small size of the site would not be able to meet the ongoing and future needs of the local community in terms of housing and infrastructure provision. Additional land (potentially greenfield/agricultural land) would be required which may lead to fragmented development with limited opportunities for providing additional infrastructure.
- 6.325 The extension of this option away from designated residential development may have a negative impact on community cohesion, the need to travel and accessibility for some. It would likely have a negative impact on the openness of the Green Belt through fragmented development and the creation of an isolated allocated area, and potentially undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary due to increased development pressure in the immediate locality (particularly to the south and east).
- 6.326 This site does not seek to focus development within the village centre, although the site is in proximity to the village which may help sustain the local services there.
- 6.327 Although there are dwellings to the north and further to the east of this site, it is not well related to existing residential development. This site has the potential to relate well with areas of public open space and the proposed Sustrans route, which could have a positive impact on health, health inequalities and healthy, active lifestyles. The proposed Greenways, however, would be less accessible from this site.
- 6.328 There is potential to improve the provision of public transport in the locality.
- 6.329 This site is situated to the south of the River Crouch, and although it is in close proximity to the Coastal Protection Belt, it is not situated within any areas of ecological importance or special landscape areas. This site is unlikely to have biodiversity value. Development may therefore not result in a loss of biodiversity in the locality. In terms of the historic environment, there are no Listed Buildings in immediate proximity to this site. This site is not situated in immediate proximity to an area at risk of flooding (flood zone 2 and 3).
- 6.330 This site is previously developed land situated on the urban fringe. It would therefore contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe. This would reduce the amount of derelict, degraded

and underused land in the locality. This option would lead to the loss of employment in the locality through the displacement of an existing business, but it would not result in a loss of employment land in the District, because it is not designated as such.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Although Option ALT1 is previously developed land, it does not perform well against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) This option would project into the Green Belt, create fragmented development and potentially undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this location.

**Option ALT2 – South of Hall Road, Rochford**

6.331 This option is a potential alternative to other West Rochford residential allocation options.

6.332 This site is situated to the west of Rochford which accords with the strategic approach outlined in the Core Strategy Submission Document. It is predominantly greenfield land with some areas of previously developed land, and is entirely situated in the Green Belt. This option could provide a mix of housing types, tenure and affordability, and may ensure the phasing of some of the required infrastructure. However, it does not have the capacity to accommodate the housing requirement for this general location, and so additional land (potentially greenfield/agricultural land) would be required which may lead to fragmented development, thus presenting constraints for infrastructure provision. Such development may also impact on community cohesion. The segregation of the sites would impact on the deliverability and accessibility of the new primary school, and community facilities etc. to be provided in this general location.

6.333 Whilst this site is situated in close proximity to Rochford town centre, it is not situated adjacent to existing residential development as this site extends east to the train line. It does, however, have good links to the existing settlement and a range of town centre services which would enable equal opportunities in terms of access and reduce the need to travel, and it could, to a certain extent, help support local businesses. It is noted, however, that public transport provision along Hall Road may be limited. There are existing bus routes and Rochford train station in proximity, thus increasing the accessibility of local services for those without access to a private car. The site is also in proximity to areas of public open space, which could have a positive impact on health, health inequalities and informal recreation. The provision of new open space may be challenging. An existing cycle route and a proposed Sustrans route may encourage healthy, active lifestyles. This option is in proximity to London Southend Airport and associated future employment opportunities. The location of this option may positively impact on air quality.

6.334 The site is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. An important consideration in this general location is the historic environment, as this option is situated within the Rochford Conservation Area and directly to the south/west are two Listed Buildings. Any development of this site would have a direct impact on the setting of these Listed Buildings. The impact on the

Conservation Area in terms of the frontage of Hall Road would need to be considered. However this option could ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained to prevent further encroachment into the Green Belt to the south of Hall Road. The eastern section of this site is situated within an area at risk of flooding (flood zone 2), and there is an area of flood zone 3 to the south. A range of SUDs may be suitable for this site to manage excess surface water.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option ALT2 performs well against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) This option would not be able to accommodate the full housing requirements for the general location of 'West Rochford' which may lead to fragmented development.
- (3) Development of this option may impact on the deliverability and viability of wider infrastructure provision in this general location.
- (4) This option has the potential to have a direct impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings.

**Option ALT3 – North of Ironwell Lane, Rochford**

6.335 This option is a potential alternative to other West Rochford residential allocation options.

6.336 This site may broadly be described as being situated to the west of Rochford which generally accords with the strategic approach outlined in the Core Strategy Submission Document. It is a combination of greenfield land and previously developed land, and is entirely situated in the Green Belt. However, a mix of housing types, tenure and affordability may not be deliverable due to the size of the site. Additional land (potentially greenfield/agricultural land) would be required which may lead to fragmented development presenting constraints for the provision of infrastructure. Such development may also impact on community cohesion. The potential segregation of the sites would impact on the deliverability and accessibility of the new primary school, and community facilities etc. to be provided in this general location. This site extends north away from Ironwell Lane which may impact on accessibility.

6.337 This site is situated in proximity to Rochford town centre and a range of local services and facilities, and although it is situated adjacent to existing residential development to the east and south, the site is segregated by the train line to the east and Ironwell Lane to the south. The site only has the potential to link to Ironwell Lane and is in close proximity to the highways network. It is in proximity to a range of town centre services which would enable equal opportunities in terms of access and reduce the need to travel. There are existing bus routes and Rochford train station in proximity, thus increasing the accessibility of local services for those without access to a private car. There is potential to improve the provision of public transport services along Ashingdon Road and West Street. The site is also in proximity to areas of public open space, which could have a positive impact on health, health inequalities and informal recreation. The provision of new open space may be challenging. However, Cherry Orchard Jubilee Country Park may be less accessible. An existing cycle route and a

proposed Sustrans route may encourage informal recreation and healthy, active lifestyles. This option is in proximity to London Southend Airport and associated future employment opportunities. The location of this option may positively impact on air quality.

- 6.338 The site is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. An important consideration in this general location is the historic environment, for example in archaeological terms. There are several Listed Buildings to the south of the site, but there is generally existing residential development between the site and these Listed Buildings. The Rochford Conservation Area is also situated to the south/south east of the site. This option could ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained to prevent further encroachment into the Green Belt to the north of Ironwell Lane.
- 6.339 A significant proportion of the western and southern section of the site is situated within an area at risk of flooding (flood zone 2 and 3). There is a greater proportion of land in flood zone 2 with a smaller section towards the western boundary within flood zone 3. Whilst there is potential for the areas at risk of flooding to accommodate public open space (water-compatible development), this would significantly reduce the capacity of the site to accommodate residential development. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water, however, it is uncertain whether the size of the site would have an impact on the viability of some measures.

#### *Recommendations*

- (1) Option ALT3 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) This site extends north away from Ironwell Lane which may impact on accessibility.
- (3) This option would create fragmented development in the general location of 'West Rochford'.
- (4) A significant proportion of the western and southern section of the site is situated within an area at risk of flooding (flood zone 2 and 3).
- (5) Areas at risk of flooding could accommodate public open space, however, this would significantly reduce the capacity of the site to accommodate residential development.

#### **Option ALT4 – East of Folly Chase, Hockley**

- 6.340 This option is a potential alternative to other West Hockley residential allocation options.
- 6.341 This site is situated to the west of Hockley which accords with the strategic approach outlined in the Core Strategy Submission Document. It has the capacity to provide the required infrastructure for this general location and a range of housing types, tenure and affordability. It is situated to the north of existing residential development on grade 3 agricultural land and there are established facilities and public transport in proximity to the site. However, it encompasses the school playing field which may enable

access for any development on this site to be provided at Chevening Gardens. This would enhance accessibility of some local services and facilities. The playing field would need to be relocated as part of any development coming forward on this site, and the potential impact this would have on minor roads in the area, particularly Chevening Gardens, around peak hours would need to be carefully considered. This site has the potential to ensure equal opportunities, in terms of access, and enhance public transport provision.

- 6.342 This site has the potential to provide access to the existing highway network, and the location of the site relates very well to existing residential development. Although there are small sections of designated residential development to the south west and south east, barriers to existing residential areas existing to the south, west and east, there is a primary school to the east, proximity to which may be beneficial to community cohesion. The site is in proximity to areas of public open space, which could have a positive impact on health, health inequalities, informal recreation and healthy, active lifestyles. It is also situated near a proposed Greenway and a proposed Sustrans route.
- 6.343 This site is bounded by a Local Wildlife Site to the south and is in proximity to other Local Wildlife Sites further to the north west. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to these Local Wildlife Sites. An area of public open space to the south/south east of this site may help mitigate any potential impact of development coming forward at this site. A potential increase in recreational pressure on Hockley Woods from any development in 'West Hockley' would need to be taken into consideration. The impact on the historic environment would need to be taken into consideration, although there are no Listed Buildings in proximity to the site.
- 6.344 This site would have a negative impact on the open, rural nature of the area, and would not make effective use of previously developed land in the locality situated on the urban fringe further to the west of this site (unlike alternatives WH2 and WH5). This site would therefore not contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe, but would unnecessarily encroach into the open Green Belt in this respect. There is potential for a defensible Green Belt boundary to be created, however, this site does not include an area to the west containing large agricultural-type buildings. This area would remain Green Belt, which would impact on the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary. The site is not in proximity to an area at risk of flooding. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water. However, it is uncertain whether the size of the site would have an impact on the viability of such measures.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option ALT4 generally performs well against the sustainability objectives compared to other West Hockley alternatives, with the exception that it promotes the development of greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available in the general location of 'West Hockley'.
- (2) This site relates very well to existing residential development and a primary school.

- (3) There is potential to provide access to the existing highway network.
- (4) It would be challenging to create a strong, defensible Green Belt boundary with this option.
- (5) Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to the Local Wildlife Sites.

### **Option ALT5 – South of the Anchor Lane/Gardiners Lane Junction, Canewdon**

- 6.345 This option is a potential alternative to other South Canewdon residential allocation options.
- 6.346 This site is situated to the south of Canewdon which accords with the strategic approach outlined in the Core Strategy Submission Document. This site would ensure the phasing of infrastructure, provide a range of housing types, tenure and affordability, and it has the capacity to provide the required play space facility. This site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land to the south of existing residential development to the south of Canewdon and is in proximity to two local shops and other local services and facilities which would ensure sustainable access to key services. The allocation of this site for residential development would provide properties for families and ensure that they do not have to leave the local area. This site would promote the regeneration and enhancement of existing rural communities through ensuring the provision of accommodation for young people and sustaining the future of the local school.
- 6.347 The severance between this site and the existing residential development to the north of Anchor Lane could have an impact on community cohesion. However, it could potentially include measures to integrate the site with the rest of the residential development, given that the barrier is unlikely to be insurmountable. The site is in proximity to areas of public open space, which could have a positive impact on health, health inequalities, informal recreation and healthy, active lifestyles. This general location does not relate well to the proposed Sustrans route or any proposed Greenways. There is also an existing bus route which provides access to the services and facilities within Rochford town centre and Ashingdon to the south west of the village. There are opportunities to enhance the existing bus service. The site has good links to Anchor Lane and the wider highway network, although the impact of providing access near to the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardiners Lane where this site is situated would need to be carefully considered with any development coming forward on this site.
- 6.348 This site is situated to the south of the River Crouch. The Coastal Protection Belt and the Upper Crouch Special Landscape Area are designated to the north west of the site, although these are landscape quality designations rather than an indication of ecological value. Any development on this site would not have an intrinsic impact on the Coastal Protection Belt designation in this area. The site is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. However, this site is in proximity to two Local Wildlife Sites. The impact on the historic environment would need to be taken into consideration. Canewdon High Street Conservation Area is in proximity to this site to the north, Canewdon Church Conservation Area is situated to the east of the High Street and there are numerous Listed Buildings.

6.349 Although there is an existing dwelling to the west of this site, its location to the south of Anchor Lane would extend the designated residential area of Canewdon further to the south. This site may not be able to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the locality. The site is not within an area at risk of flooding. SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option ALT5 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) Although the severance between this site and the existing residential development to the north of Anchor Lane could have an impact on community cohesion, this barrier is unlikely to be insurmountable.
- (3) The impact of providing access near to the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardiners Lane would need to be carefully considered with any development coming forward on this site.
- (4) Although there is an existing dwelling to the west, the location of this site would extend the designated residential area of Canewdon further to the south.
- (5) This site may not be able to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the locality.

**Option ALT6 – North of Gardiners Lane and South of Lambourne Hall Road, Canewdon**

6.350 This option is a potential alternative to other South Canewdon residential allocation options.

6.351 This site is situated to the south of existing residential development along Lambourne Hall Road to the east of Canewdon and it is debatable as to whether this site could be considered commensurate with the strategic approach outlined in the Core Strategy Submission Document. Due to the size of the site, it may not provide a range of housing types, tenure and affordability, ensure equal opportunities or have the capacity to ensure the phasing of infrastructure to meet the needs of the local community. Whilst the allocation of this site for residential development would provide some properties for families and ensure that they do not have to leave the local area, to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy Submission Document, any development on this site would either have to be at a high density or additional land would be required. This has the potential to lead to fragmented development with limited opportunities for providing additional infrastructure. Nevertheless this site would promote the regeneration and enhancement of existing rural communities through ensuring the provision of some accommodation for young people and sustaining the future of the local school.

6.352 Although this site adjoins existing residential development to the north along Lambourne Hall Road, the site is separated from the main residential area to the west by the primary school and the allotments, which could have an impact on community cohesion. There is accessible public open space to the north, west and south of the site, which have the potential to improve health, reduce health inequalities, promote informal recreation and may also encourage healthy, active lifestyles. However, this site does not relate well to the proposed Sustrans route or any proposed Greenways.

- 6.353 This site is situated to the east/south east of local services situated in the centre of the village, which would ensure sustainable access to key services. The existing bus service provides access to Rochford town centre and Ashingdon to the south west of the site, and there are opportunities to enhance this provision. The site has the potential to connect to Gardiners Lane and the wider highway network, although the impact of providing access near to the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardiners Lane given this site's location would need to be carefully considered with any development coming forward on this site. There is limited potential to connect this site directly onto Lambourne Hall Road or Anchor Lane due to the enclosure of the site both to the north and west. A link may be provided outside of the site but this would require additional Green Belt land potentially to the east/north east.
- 6.354 This site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land to the south of the River Crouch. The Coastal Protection Belt and the Upper Crouch Special Landscape Area are designated to the north west of the site, although these are landscape quality designations rather than an indication of ecological value. Any development on this site would not have an intrinsic impact on the Coastal Protection Belt designation in this area. The site is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. However, there is a pond to the north of the site along Lambourne Hall Road, which may have biodiversity value, and it is in close proximity to two Local Wildlife Sites. The impact on the historic environment would need to be taken into consideration. Canewdon High Street Conservation Area is in proximity to this site to the north, Canewdon Church Conservation Area is situated to the east of the High Street and there are numerous Listed Buildings.
- 6.355 The site is enclosed by Gardiners Lane to the south, dwellings to the north, a primary school and allotments to the west and it follows a natural field boundary to the east. This site would be able to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the locality. The site is not within an area at risk of flooding. The site has the capacity to include SUDs, however, it is uncertain whether the size of the site would have an impact on the viability of some measures.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option ALT6 performs well against the sustainability objectives, however, it is debatable as to whether this site could be considered commensurate within the general location of 'South Canewdon'.
- (2) Any development on this site would either have to be at a high density or additional land would be required to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy Submission Document. This has the potential to lead to fragmented development with limited opportunities for providing additional infrastructure.
- (3) The site is separated from the main residential area to the west by the primary school and the allotments, which could have an impact on community cohesion.
- (4) The impact of providing access near to the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardiners Lane given this site's location would need to be carefully considered with any development coming forward on this site.

- (5) There is limited potential to connect this site directly onto Lambourne Hall Road or Anchor Lane due to the enclosure of the site both to the north and west.
- (6) A link may be provided outside of the site but this would require additional Green Belt land potentially to the east/north east.
- (7) This site would be able to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the locality.

### **Option ALT7 – Potash Garden Centre, Main Road, Hawkwell**

- 6.356 This option is a potential alternative to other South Hawkwell residential allocation options.
- 6.357 This site is situated to the south of Hawkwell which accords with the strategic approach outlined in the Core Strategy Submission Document. Although this site has an existing use as a garden centre and adjoining dwelling, it is not previously developed land. The relatively small size of the site would not be able to meet the ongoing and future needs of the local community in terms of a range of housing type, tenure and affordability and infrastructure provision, and additional land potentially in the Green Belt would be required to meet the shortfall. This has the potential to impact negatively on community cohesion through the creation of fragmented development. It would extend the allocated residential area to the south of Main Road which would impact on equal opportunities and potentially create an island of allocated residential development within the Green Belt. In this instance it is recommended that surrounding dwellings are allocated as residential development, although the development of this site may subject adjacent areas to development pressure and thus undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in the locality. This would have a negative impact on existing communities.
- 6.358 Although there are dwellings to the north and east of this site, it is not well related to existing residential development which is designated as such. This has the potential to impact on community cohesion. Additional land would be needed to fulfil the dwelling and infrastructure requirements for this general location which would have a further negative impact on community cohesion. The proximity of the site to public open space may improve health and reduce health inequalities and would promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles. This site has the potential to connect to the proposed Sustrans route, although a proposed Greenway would be less accessible from this site. There are a range of local facilities in proximity to this site and there is an existing bus route along Main Road which runs to the centre of Hockley to the north west and Rochford town centre to the south east which would enable equal opportunities in terms of access. Essential services will therefore be accessible to those without access to private transport. There is potential to increase the availability of sustainable transport modes.
- 6.359 This option would lead to the loss of employment in the locality through the displacement of an existing business, but it would not result in a loss of employment land in the District, because it is not designated as such. There are employment uses to the north along Main Road (Thorpe Road Industrial Estate) which may ensure access to jobs; however, this is allocated in the Replacement Local Plan (2006) to be redeveloped for residential uses. This site can connect to Main Road and therefore has good highways access.

- 6.360 The site is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance, although development in this location has the potential to increase recreational pressure on these, such as Hockley Woods. This site is situated to the north of a Local Wildlife Site and another Local Wildlife Site is situated further to the south west. Furthermore although much of the site is situated within the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area encompassing Hockley Woods and Cherry Orchard Jubilee Country Park, these are landscape quality designations rather than an indication of ecological value. There is also a pond to the south of the site which may have biodiversity value. In terms of the historic environment, there is a Grade II Listed Building in close proximity to the site whose setting would need to be considered with any development.
- 6.361 The existing land use (a garden centre) is considered to be an inappropriate use on the urban fringe. Reallocating this site for residential development would therefore contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe. It is uncertain whether some of the land, due to its current use, is contaminated. However, any development on this site would either have to be at a high density or additional land would be required to meet the requirements set out in the Core Strategy Submission Document. This site is situated to the south of Main Road to the south of designated existing residential development in Hawkwell. It is enclosed by dwellings to the east and west, a road to the north and it has an established boundary to the south, therefore it has the potential to ensure that a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained. However, it could create an island of allocated residential development within the Green Belt which could undermine this. The site is not within an area at risk of flooding. The site has the capacity to include SUDs, however, it is uncertain whether the size of the site would have an impact on the viability of some measures.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option ALT7 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) Although it has an existing use as a garden centre and adjoining dwelling, it is not previously developed land.
- (3) Additional land potentially in the Green Belt would be required to meet the shortfall in housing and infrastructure provision in the general location of 'South Hawkwell'. This has the potential to impact negatively on community cohesion through the creation of fragmented development.
- (4) This option would extend the allocated residential area to the south of Main Road. It would potentially create an island of allocated residential development within the Green Belt.
- (5) If this site is taken forward then surrounding dwellings should be allocated as residential development. However, the development of this site may subject adjacent areas to development pressure and thus undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in the locality.

- (6) Although there are dwellings to the north and east of this site, it is not well related to existing residential development which is designated as such.
- (7) This option would lead to the loss of employment in the locality through the displacement of an existing business, but it would not result in a loss of employment land, because it is not designated as such.
- (8) The existing land use is considered to be an inappropriate use on the urban fringe, and so reallocating this site would contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe.
- (9) This option has the potential to ensure that a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained in this locality. However, it could create an island of allocated residential development within the Green Belt which could undermine this.

### **Option ALT8 – Land at Madrid Avenue, Rayleigh**

6.362 This option is a potential alternative to other Gypsy and Traveller site allocation options.

6.363 The site, due to its size and location to the north west of existing residential development in the main settlement of Rayleigh, has the potential to have a positive impact on the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities and promote equal opportunities through the provision of a permanent site. However, the allocation of this site would have a significant impact on local landscape character and the openness of the Green Belt as the site is situated in a prominent location. Although part of the site has been developed and there is residential development further to the east along the northern side of Rawreth Lane (although it is not designated as such), its allocation would create a small island of allocated land within the Green Belt. The lack of enclosure on three sides of this site and the creation of an isolated allocated area of land in the Green Belt also raises concerns regarding the potential to ensure a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary in the locality if this site were allocated. As with the alternative options, the provision of an authorised Gypsy and Traveller site(s) would help meet the need for the provision of accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and could help reduce income and quality of life disparities as the residents will be enabled to seek employment from a permanent location. However, due to the scale of the site, it may not be able to accommodate the full pitch requirement for the District which may impact on equal opportunities in this regard.

6.364 The location of this site in proximity to the existing residential area and a bus route could potentially have a positive impact on ensure equal opportunities, social inclusion, equal access, health inequalities and may promote community cohesion. It is also close to several public open spaces which may have the potential to promote informal recreation and consequently, healthy active lifestyles. There is also potential to improve public transport links. However the extension of the site to the north away from Rawreth Lane may impact on accessibility for some, particularly for those without access to private transport. There are high voltage power lines running across the site with a mast in close proximity to the eastern boundary, and there are also high voltage

power lines to the west of the site. As the lines run through the site, they would have the potential to have a negative impact on health. It is unlikely to be viable to move these obstructions given the scale of the proposed land use.

6.365 Rawreth Industrial Estate to the south of Rawreth Lane to the south east of the site is designated an AQMA. There may be some impact on the A1245, and highways access from this site will need to be negotiated carefully. Due to the scale of the site, however, it is unlikely that there will be an impact on significant junctions in the locality. It is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance. In terms of the historic environment there are two Grade II Listed Buildings which may need to be considered with any development coming forward in this location. The site is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although that there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 further to the south of the site to the south of Rawreth Lane.

#### *Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option ALT8 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) Due to the scale of the site, it may not be able to accommodate the full pitch requirement for the District.
- (3) The lack of enclosure on three sides of this site and the creation of an isolated allocated area of land in the Green Belt raises concerns regarding the potential to ensure a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary in the locality if this site were allocated.
- (4) The allocation of this option would have a significant impact on local landscape character.
- (5) The extension of the site to the north away from Rawreth Lane may impact on accessibility for some, particularly for those without access to private transport.
- (6) There are high voltage power lines running across the site with a mast in close proximity to the eastern boundary, and there are also high voltage power lines to the west of the site. As the lines run through the site, they would have the potential to have a negative impact on health. It is unlikely to be viable to move these obstructions given the proposed land use.
- (7) There may be some impact on the A1245, and highways access from this site will need to be negotiated carefully.

#### **Option ALT9 – West of Purdeys Industrial Estate, Sutton Road, Rochford**

6.366 This option is a potential alternative to other employment land options.

6.367 It is situated to the south east of Rochford town centre which does not accord with the strategic approach to the allocation of new employment land outlined in the Core Strategy Submission Document.

- 6.368 This option would secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District as any allocation to the west of Purdeys Industrial Estate would be designated in addition to the strategic locations identified in the Core Strategy Submission Document, and appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal process. However, although the Employment Land Study (2008) states that Purdeys Industrial Estate, which is to the east of this site, is “a fit for purpose industrial estate which should be maintained and, if possible, expanded.” (page 70), it does not conclude or provide justification for additional Green Belt land to be reallocated in this area.
- 6.369 Whilst this option would be able to create a defensible Green Belt boundary, it would result in the loss of Green Belt land in the District where no justification for such loss is evidenced and would impact on the local landscape and openness of the area.
- 6.370 The designation of this site would enable a connection of the existing employment land to the east with Southend Road or Sutton Road and provide additional access points which has the potential to reduce the traffic impact on the Sutton Road/Purdeys Way roundabout, although further employment development in this location would have a greater impact on the local highway network than at present. Additional traffic on both Sutton Road and Southend Road may also have a negative impact, but it is acknowledged that the scale of such a development in this location has the potential to engender local highway improvements.
- 6.371 This site is situated to the north east of London Southend Airport, and is not as well related to this key economic driver unlike the general location 'North of London Southend Airport' which will be allocated independently through the London Southend Airport Joint Area Action Plan. There are physical barriers between the site and the airport including dwellings, a main road (Southend Road) and the National Express East Anglia train line. Furthermore the allocation of this site has the potential to dilute the concentration of businesses around the airport and the agglomeration benefits potentially arising from this relationship, which could have a negative impact on the local economy and detract from the economic potential of London Southend Airport.
- 6.372 This option is well related to Rochford town centre, and has the potential to have a positive impact on the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities through the provision of accessible local employment opportunities. It also has the potential to ensure equal opportunities, and may improve business development, although this is not site specific. Although it would ensure access to jobs in this area, it has the potential to detract from future employment opportunities to the west of Rayleigh, south of Great Wakering and to the north of London Southend Airport, and thus potentially have an overall negative effect on social exclusion.
- 6.373 Existing employment land would be extended towards residential development if this option were taken forward, which has the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' land use, although this would depend on the type of employment promoted on the site should it come forward. There is potential to create a public open space buffer to mitigate the impact of further employment development in this location on existing communities. This would, however, need to be balanced against the extension of the existing employment land in this location, the impact on the strategic vision for employment uses in the future as set out in the Core Strategy Submission Document and the cumulative impact on the local highway network, both around Rochford town centre and beyond.

- 6.374 This option is grade 1 agricultural land situated in the Green Belt on the urban fringe of Rochford, however, it would not have the potential to contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe given that it is Green Belt.
- 6.375 This site is situated near a proposed Greenway to the east and a proposed Sustrans route. There is potential to improve public transport links along Southend Road and Sutton Road. This site is also in proximity to Rochford train station which is situated to the north west. Although it is well related to the train station adjacent to the airport retail park, this station serves London Southend Airport customers and would therefore not increase the availability of sustainable transport modes in the locality.
- 6.376 The impact on light and noise pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future. This site is partly situated within the London Southend Airport Lden noise contours and the London Southend Airport Lnight noise contours.
- 6.377 This option is not in immediate proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, however, the River Roach is situated further to the east and is protected through a range of nature conservation designations. Furthermore there is a Local Wildlife Site to the south of the site to the south of Sutton Road, and the potential impact on this site would need to be carefully considered with any development on this site. Although Local Wildlife Sites may be used for recreational purposes, it is important that development does not have a negative impact.
- 6.378 The potential impact on the historic environment would also need to be considered with any development of the site for employment use. There are also two Grade II Listed Buildings in proximity to the site to the north west and Rochford Conservation Area is situated further to the north/north west.
- 6.379 The south east corner of the site bordering Sutton Road is situated within flood zone 2 and 3, however, employment land is categorised within PPS25 as a 'less vulnerable' use.

*Recommendations/Key Observations*

- (1) Option ALT9 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives.
- (2) It is well related to Rochford town centre.
- (3) This option is not situated within a strategic location identified within the Core Strategy Submission Document for additional employment land.
- (4) This option would secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District as any allocation to the west of Purdeys Industrial Estate would be designated in addition to the strategic locations identified in the Core Strategy Submission Document, and appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal process.
- (5) Although it would ensure access to jobs in this area, it has the potential to detract from future employment opportunities to the west of Rayleigh, south of Great Wakering and to the north of London Southend Airport.

- (6) Whilst this option would be able to create a defensible Green Belt boundary, it would result in the loss of Green Belt land in the District where no justification for such loss is evidenced and would impact on the local landscape and openness of the area.
- (7) This site is situated to the north east of London Southend Airport, and is not as well related to this key economic driver unlike the general location 'North of London Southend Airport' which will be allocated independently through the London Southend Airport Joint Area Action Plan.
- (8) There are physical barriers between the site and the airport.
- (9) Existing employment land would be extended towards residential development if this option were taken forward.
- (10) There is potential to create a public open space buffer between this option and on existing communities.