

# **Local Development Framework Sub-Committee – 30 October 2012**

---

Minutes of the meeting of the **Local Development Sub-Committee** held on **30 October 2012** when there were present:-

Chairman: Cllr K H Hudson

Cllr C I Black  
Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn  
Cllr K J Gordon

Cllr C G Seagers  
Cllr S P Smith

## **VISITING MEMBERS**

Cllrs B T Hazlewood and R A Oatham.

## **OFFICERS PRESENT**

S Scrutton	- Head of Planning and Transportation
S Hollingworth	- Team Leader (Planning Policy)
A Law	- Solicitor
Natalie Hayward	- Senior Planner
Velda Wong	- Planner
S Worthington	- Committee Administrator

## **4 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## **5 HOCKLEY AREA ACTION PLAN – DRAFT PRE-SUBMISSION DOCUMENT**

The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Transportation asking Members to approve the draft pre-submission version of the Council's Hockley Area Action Plan for pre-submission consultation, prior to being submitted (along with the results of consultation) to the Government for examination. Members considered each of the policies contained within the document, and the tables at the end of the document, one by one.

In response to a Member question relating to policy 3(c) on page 41 of the document, officers advised that the aim was not one of improving the visibility of the railway station, but rather of making it more usable and more integrated into Hockley.

Officers advised, in response to a Member enquiry about policy 3(a) on page 41 of the document, that no particular pedestrian route was specified in the document; figure 17 on page 45 of the document proposed a framework for movement around Hockley.

Officers confirmed, in response to a Member question about policy 4(b) on page 47 of the document, that this was based on 3-bedroom houses that met the Council's garden standard for size.

In response to a Member enquiry as to whether policy 5 on page 49 of the document would involve the retention of the clinic at the beginning of Eldon Way, officers advised that the draft Plan did not require it to be re-developed, but nor did it state that it must be retained.

Officers confirmed, in response to a Member query about policy 6(b) on page 51 of the document, that the floor space was intended for retail and storage.

In response to a Member observation that the costs of funding the proposed Spa Road public realm enhancements were high, officers advised that developers would be expected to fund this by way of the community infrastructure levy / planning obligations.

Officers advised, in response to a Member question about policy 4 on page 60 of the document, that this was a plan for the whole of the centre of Hockley, not just Eldon Way, as illustrated in the plan on page 33 of the document.

Members unanimously endorsed all the policies within the pre-submission document.

### **Recommended to Council**

- (1) That the draft Hockley Area Action Plan Pre-Submission Document be accepted for pre-submission consultation, followed by formal submission to the Secretary of State.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Transportation, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation, to make minor amendments to the document prior to submission to the Secretary of State, excluding those that would materially alter policy, having regard to the results of pre-submission consultation, in order to ensure soundness of the submission document. (HPT)

## **6 ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT – DRAFT PRE-SUBMISSION VERSION**

The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Transportation asking Members to approve the draft pre-submission version of the Council's Allocations Development Plan Document for pre-submission consultation, prior to being submitted (along with the results of consultation) to the Government for examination. Copies of an addendum to the document were circulated to the Sub-Committee, proposing amendments to the draft pre-submission version of the document.

Members considered each of the policies contained within the document, one by one.

**Policies BFR1 – BFR4**

Responding to a Member query as to whether the figure of up to 131 dwellings for the Star Lane Industrial Estate site, detailed on page 14 of the document was subject to any variation, officers advised that this was the case, depending on the kinds of planning applications that came forward for this site in the future. In response to a supplementary question as to whether this would rise by 5% in the event of other sites within the Plan not being developed, officers confirmed that this site was not within the Green Belt, thus the density of buildings may vary, but the 5% uplift will not apply.

Officers confirmed, in response to a Member enquiry relating to page 14 of the document, that it would be possible to include a clause within policy OS2 on page 116 of the document to indicate that, where practicable, consideration will be given to the protection of any land allocated as new public open space, through trusts or other arrangements, which safeguards the long term future of the public open space.

It was, however, noted that the expectation would be that such trusts should maintain the new open spaces, not the District Council; each case would have to be considered carefully.

A Member made particular reference to the merit of trying to ensure that this policy made provision for new allotments to be made available within the identified sites. Officers advised that the provision of allotments is referred to throughout the document.

The Sub-Committee endorsed policies BFR1, BFR2, BFR3 and BFR4, subject to the amendments detailed in the addendum to the document

**Policy SER1**

It was noted that the changes proposed in the addendum to paragraphs 5 to 7 on page 31 of the document were for the sake of clarity around the quantum of dwellings on sites and infrastructure requirements and the 5% flexibility allowance.

In response to a Member question relating to the third paragraph on page 35 of the document, officers advised that the area of 3.1 hectares referred to was an informative. Responding to a further Member query about the reference to 4 hectares in paragraph 4 of page 35, officers confirmed that this did not refer to an additional amount, but a total of 4 hectares. Officers drew Members' attention to the amendment to paragraph 4 of page 35 proposed in the addendum, which addressed this issue. Officers confirmed, in response to an additional question about the green buffer referred to in this paragraph, that

## **Local Development Framework Sub-Committee – 30 October 2012**

---

this would be parkland, but the size of the buffer is not specified; the key was to create a clear boundary to the Green Belt.

A Member observed that it was uncertain as to whether the new primary school included within the infrastructure for this site was necessary, given that there was capacity at St Nicholas Primary School; it would not be ideal to waste space on a primary school if it was not actually needed. Officers emphasised that the site and associated infrastructure came directly from the Council's adopted Core Strategy on which Essex County Council had input with respect to educational provision. If the situation was to change within a 5-year period it was possible that funds would not be required for a new primary school, however it was not advisable to weaken the policy by altering the wording at this early stage. In response to a further Member question as to whether further traffic impact assessment work was needed before going out to public consultation on the draft document, officers stressed again that the policies within the document were contained within the Core Strategy, on which there had been extensive consultation with County Highways.

Members recommended that, in addition to the paragraph stating that a bus-only link be provided between London Road and Rawreth Lane, the possibility of a link for all forms of vehicular traffic should be explored.

The Sub-Committee endorsed the replacement of paragraph 6 of page 35 relating to the relocation of a playing field and associated facilities, for the sake of clarity.

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy SER1, subject to the amendments detailed in the addendum to the document.

**(Note:** Cllr C I Black wished it to be recorded that he had voted against this.)

### **Policy SER2**

It was noted that the wording on the addendum for paragraphs 5 to 7 on page 37 of the document should be amended so that 'minimum of 600 dwellings' becomes 'no more than 600 dwellings'. Members confirmed this approach should be taken to all SER policies.

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy SER2, subject to the amendments detailed in the addendum to the document.

### **Policies SER3 - SER5**

The Sub-Committee endorsed policies SER3, SER4 and SER5, subject to the amendments detailed in the addendum.

**Policy SER6**

In response to a Member question relating to the pressures on the capacity of the local highways and on the need for improvements to Watery Lane, officers further emphasised that the Core Strategy was undertaken with full input from County Highways; as proposals come forward in due course any infrastructure proposals relating to highways will have to be agreed with County Highways and the District Council.

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy SER6, subject to the amendments detailed in the addendum to the document.

**(Note:** Cllr C I Black wished it to be recorded that he had voted against this.)

**Policies SER7 - SER9**

The Sub-Committee endorsed policies SER7, SER8 and SER9, subject to the amendments detailed in the addendum to the document.

**Policy GT1**

In response to a Member observation that the suggested amendments in the addendum relating to pages 74 and 145 of the document were contradictory, officers concurred and it was agreed that the final replacement sentence for paragraph 4 on page 74 of the document, detailed on page 13 of the addendum, should replace the amendment to page 145 detailed at the end of page 14 of the addendum.

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy GT1, subject to the amendments detailed in the addendum to the document and in the addendum to the Minutes.

**Policies EEL1 - EEL3 and Policies NEL1 - NEL4**

The Sub-Committee endorsed policies EEL1, EEL2, EEL3, NEL1, NEL2, NEL3 and NEL4, subject to the amendment to policy NEL1 detailed in the addendum to the document.

**Policy ELA1**

In response to a Member question as to whether Cherry Orchard Country Park should be included in this policy, officers advised that this was not appropriate, as it is not a local wildlife site; it is included on page 112 of the document under the policy dealing with the Upper Roach Valley (Policy ELA3).

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy ELA1.

**Policies ELA2 - ELA3 and Policies EDU1 - EDU4**

The Sub-Committee endorsed policies, ELA2, ELA3, EDU1, EDU2, EDU3 and EDU4, subject to the amendments to policy EDU4 detailed in the addendum to the document.

**Policy OSL1**

A Member objected to the omission of the playing fields referred to on page 35 of the document from this policy.

Another Member observed that figure 34 should be checked again to ensure that a small piece of green in Woodlands Avenue/Weir Gardens, Rayleigh is included in the plan and the plan adjusted, if necessary.

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy OSL1, subject to the amendments, as detailed in the addendum to the Minutes.

**Policy OSL2**

It was noted that North of London Road should be included within the bullet points on page 117 of the document.

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy OSL2, subject to the amendment above.

**Policy OSL3**

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy OSL3, subject to the amendments detailed on the addendum to the document.

**Policy TCB1**

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy TCB1.

**Policy TCB2**

In response to a Member question as to whether West Street could be included in the designated primary shopping area detailed in figure 44 on page 122 of the document, officers advised that it would be appropriate to review this when considering the Rochford Area Action Plan.

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy TCB2.

**Policy TCB3**

The Sub-Committee endorsed policy TCB3.

**Recommended to Council**

- (1) That the draft Pre-Submission Allocations Development Plan Document be accepted for pre-submission consultation, followed by formal submission to the Secretary of State, subject to the amendments detailed in the addendum to the document and in the addendum to the Minutes.
  
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Transportation, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation, to make minor amendments to the document prior to submission to the Secretary of State, excluding those that would materially alter policy, having regard to the results of pre-submission consultation, in order to ensure soundness of the submission document. (HPT)

The meeting commenced at 7.30 pm and closed at 9.20 pm.

Chairman .....

Date .....

If you would like these minutes in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111.

**Suggested Amendments to Draft Pre-Submission Allocations Development Plan Document in Addition to Amendments Detailed**

<p>Page 33 – paragraph 6: Policy SER1</p>	<p>Add text:-  The potential for a link for all forms of vehicular traffic between London Road and Rawreth Lane should be explored</p>
<p>Page 35 – paragraph 6: Policy SER1</p>	<p>Replace text on page with:-  The playing field to the south of the site along London Road should be relocated. A replacement sports field with new ancillary facilities together with a new club house will be required to be provided ahead of any removal of the existing facility so as to ensure the continued and uninterrupted operation of this valuable community facility. The new structure will be required to be built to the BREEAM (very good) standard thus providing a new, efficient and environmentally friendly establishment, which will be of great advantage to the community as a whole and to the operators of the Sports and Social Club. It should be located within the green buffer to the west of the site, although the arrangement of the facility should be such that the club house and associated facilities are positioned adjacent to the residential settlement to the east and integrated into the development. It is calculated that the new club house will be built within 340 metres of the existing location and will be served by a new road. Additionally, this facility should be well connected to the pedestrian and cycling network.</p>
<p>Policies SER1-9</p>	<p>Replace ‘a minimum of [number of dwellings] dwellings’ at the end of the first sentence on page 4 of the addendum with ‘no more than [number of dwellings] dwellings...’</p>
<p>Page 145 – Implementation and Delivery</p>	<p>Replace paragraph on page 14 of the addendum with:-  ‘The Council will seek to acquire this land and will ensure that it is appropriately managed by or on behalf of the Council’.</p>
<p>Page 109: figure 34 – Existing</p>	<p>Figure 34 adjusted, if necessary, to include open</p>

**Local Development Framework Sub-Committee  
– 30 October 2012**

---

Open Space in Rayleigh/Rawreth	space in Woodlands Avenue/Weir Gardens.
Page 111: figure 36 – Existing Open Space in Hockley/Hawkwell	Figure 36 adjusted to include Magnolia open space.
Page 113: figure 38 – Existing Open Space in Rochford	Figure 38 adjusted to exclude Magnolia open space.
Page 116: Policy OS2 – New Open Space	Text to be inserted to indicate that, where practicable, consideration will be given to the protection of any land allocated as new public open space, through trusts or other arrangements, which safeguards the long term future of the public open space.
Page 117: Policy OS2 – New Open Space	Bullet point to be inserted: ‘North of London Road’.