

## **Local Development Framework Sub-Committee – 1 July 2009**

---

Minutes of the meeting of the **Local Development Sub-Committee** held on **1 July 2009** when there were present:-

Chairman: Cllr K H Hudson

Cllr C I Black

Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn

Cllr T E Goodwin

Cllr K J Gordon

Cllr J M Pullen

### **VISITING MEMBERS**

Cllrs J R F Mason, R A Oatham, C G Seagers and Mrs M J Webster.

### **OFFICERS PRESENT**

S Scrutton	- Head of Planning and Transportation
S Hollingworth	- Team Leader (Planning Policy)
N Hayward	- Town Planner
S Worthington	- Committee Administrator

### **3 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2009 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **4 ROCHFORD DISTRICT CORE STRATEGY – SUBMISSION DOCUMENT**

**(Note:** Cllr C G Seagers declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of membership of the Crouch Harbour Authority and of being a regular user of Essex Marina.)

The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Transportation seeking Members' approval of the submission version of the Rochford District Core Strategy for pre-submission consultation, followed by submission to the Secretary of State for examination.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation extended thanks to Cllr Mrs C A Weston for her input as a Member of this Sub-Committee during the last Municipal year and welcomed Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn to the Sub-Committee.

Officers drew attention to the following corrections that would be made to the document prior to public consultation:-

- Page 94 – Policy T2 – second bullet point: Add “to improve traffic flows and reduce congestion.

- Page 94 – Policy T2 – third bullet point: Replace with “Rectory Road/Ashingdon Road roundabout.
- Page 120 – Policy RTC5: insert final bullet point: “Promotes youth community facilities”.

One Member expressed concern that the proposals for North of London Road, Rayleigh, detailed in policy H2, would fail to achieve the objectives outlined on page 5 of the Core Strategy submission document. Particular reference was made to the proposal for 550 additional new dwellings in the area North of London Road resulting in the population of Rawreth being doubled and to the fact that Rawreth Lane was already highly developed.

Concern was also expressed that the infrastructure listed on page 43 of the document for North of London Road included a new primary school, which, it was claimed, could not be sustained by the building of 550 new dwellings. Concern was also raised that the wording relating to the buffer between new development and agricultural land to the west should be strengthened to protect the proposed park land.

Reference was also made to the possibility of including a swimming pool in the list of infrastructure for this location. Officers confirmed that it would be possible to strengthen the wording relating to the buffer; there would be a significant level of protection to the land, in any case, as it would fall within the protection of Green Belt policy. It would, however, be difficult to deliver a new swimming pool as part of the proposed infrastructure for this location. Some Members observed that it would be unrealistic to include a new swimming pool in the infrastructure list, given the current economic climate; swimming pools were not turning over a profit.

During debate of proposals for alternative locations proposed by Rawreth Parish Council, which had all been visited by the Sub-Committee, it was emphasised that the Parish Council's proposals constituted a series of piecemeal developments that did not offer the potential to deliver vital infrastructure and, as such, were unsustainable.

There was a general consensus that the statement relating to the park land buffer on page 43 should be strengthened and that, given concerns about the ongoing maintenance costs of a swimming pool in the current economic climate, this should not be included in the infrastructure list for the North of London Road site within appendix 1. It was also felt that the 550 new dwellings proposed for that location was the only sustainable option for that part of the District.

One Member expressed thanks that the views of Hawkwell residents during the public consultation had been taken into account in developing the Submission document. The revised figure of new dwellings in South Hawkwell was an improvement on previous proposals.

In response to a Member request for clarification around the pre-submission consultation and the soundness of the Core Strategy document, officers advised that:-

- There were basic tests to assess whether the Core Strategy document was sound in line with the Regional Spatial Strategy and central Government planning policy guidance. Tests would seek to assess if the contents of the document were reasonable and capable of being delivered. The assessments that would have to be undertaken would be different to those previously applied to Local Plan documents.
- The Public Inquiry would assess whether the proposed locations for new dwellings were sound and could accommodate the numbers proposed; it would not be an opportunity to offer alternative sites.
- The pre-submission public consultation was the final formal stage prior to submission of the Core Strategy document to the Secretary of State; all further views on the content of the Core Strategy gathered during this period would be sent, together with the Core Strategy document, evidence base documents, and supporting documents.
- It was anticipated that the 6-week consultation would commence approximately a week after the Core Strategy Council meeting on 9 September.

In response to a Member enquiry relating to the Lifetime Homes Standard, officers confirmed that this did not include the requirement for new homes to include charging points for electric vehicles; it might, however, be appropriate to include this in one of the forthcoming development plan documents.

Officers confirmed, in response to a Member question about the infrastructure listed in appendix 1, that this was more than a wish list; the Core Strategy was a spatial plan and a vast range of organisations had been consulted including, for example, Education and Health Authorities; appendix 1 comprised of a list of requirements that were necessary for each of the development locations. It was clear that, given the current economic climate, it would be extremely challenging to meet the affordable housing requirements outlined in the document.

Responding to a Member enquiry relating to the fourth bullet point on page 42 of the document, relating to policy H7, officers advised that this referred to pitches that would accommodate two caravans; the existing site off the A130 would be examined during preparation of the site allocations development plan document.

During debate of the Local List, officers confirmed that the new Local List would include more detail than its predecessor similar to the contents of a statutory listing. Particular reference was also made during discussion of historical and archaeological sites, as detailed on page 67 of the document,

that there might be reference to a Saxon site in Rawreth, in the vicinity of Asda, with more reference to the famous battle at Ashingdon.

With reference to policy CLT5 on page 83 of the document, Members, while mindful of the potential ongoing maintenance costs, nevertheless requested that the provision of public conveniences should be encouraged, as well as public art, within open spaces.

Members concurred that the fourth bullet point on page 108 of the document should be replaced with: "Sweyne Industrial Estate, Ashingdon Road".

In response to a Member enquiry about the Asda store off Rawreth Lane, officers confirmed that this constituted a modest retail store that was sited within a residential area of the town; there were other modest retail stores at, for example, Golden Cross and the south end of Hullbridge. Responding to a Member comment relating to retail outlets in Hullbridge being converted into flats, officers advised that the Core Strategy would seek to prevent such instances in the future.

Members thanked officers for all their hard work on the document and drew particular attention to the section on implementation, delivery and monitoring, which was perceived to be interesting, informative and well-written.

### **Recommended to Council**

That, subject to the amendments listed in the appendix to the Minutes, the Rochford Core Strategy Submission Document be accepted for pre-submission consultation, followed by formal submission to the Secretary of State. (HPT)

The meeting commenced at 7.30 pm and closed at 9.00 pm.

Chairman .....

Date .....

If you would like these minutes in large print, braille or another language please contact 01702 546366.

**Appendix**

Page 43  
North of London Road,  
Rayleigh

Fifth bullet point: Insert “A1245,” after “between”

Page 83  
Policy CLT5 – Open  
Space

Third paragraph: Insert “public conveniences and” after  
“Provision of”

Page 94  
Policy T2

Second bullet point: Insert at end “to improve traffic flows  
and reduce congestion.”

Third bullet point. Replace with: “Rectory  
Road/Ashingdon Road Roundabout”.

Page 108  
Existing Employment  
Land

Fourth bullet point: Replace with “Sweyne Industrial  
Estate, Ashingdon Road”.

Page 120  
Policy RTC5

Insert additional bullet point: “Promotes youth community  
facilities”.