

1 REPORT OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SUB-COMMITTEE – 18 SEPTEMBER 2007

URBAN CAPACITY STUDY

1.1 This item of business was referred by the Local Framework Development Sub-Committee on 18 September 2007 to the Executive Board with recommendations relating to the adoption of the Urban Capacity Study 2007 as part of the evidence base for the Council's Local Development Framework. A copy of the officers report to the Sub-Committee is attached at Appendix A.

1.2 The Sub-Committee noted that:-

- In the preferred scenario, K, no allowance had been made in the figures for future applications to build flats, as this was an unknown factor. Government advice was that intensification should not generally be a factor when calculating the requirement for the release of green field sites for housing development. However, it was accepted that the requirement for a minimum housing provision of 4600 housing units, as laid down by the East of England Plan, might well be exceeded due to intensification.
- In due course the Council would be reviewing development control policies to determine that they were fit for purpose and to discuss whether any modifications were needed.
- When calculating further housing provision it may be possible to ascertain that proposals for the building of flats are granted in areas of the District that are deemed appropriate.
- One element that the Core Strategy would be looking at would be the high percentage of Rochford District residents commuting out of the District to work.
- The East of England Plan required the creation of 3000 net new jobs over the plan period to 2021.
- Planning policy statement no 3 stated that Local Authorities needed to examine all non-residential parts of their urban areas to ascertain whether they should be replaced by housing. Any new employment sites had to be located in sustainable locations with easy access routes.
- Although 'work and live' units might be part of consideration of future housing allocation, resale of such properties was often difficult.

1.3 It is proposed that the Executive Board **RESOLVES**

- (1) That, subject to further consultation with land developers, land-owners and agents, the Urban Capacity Study 2007 be adopted as part of the

evidence base for the production of the Council's Local Development Framework.

- (2) That scenario K be adopted as the most realistic assessment on which to base calculations for green field housing requirements.
- (3) That further work is undertaken to align the Urban Capacity Study with the new Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment methodology. (HPT)

2 REPORT OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SUB-COMMITTEE – 19 SEPTEMBER 2007

ROCHFORD CORE STRATEGY – PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION

- 2.1 This item of business was referred by the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee on 19 September 2007 to the Executive Board with recommendations relating to the preparation of a revised Core Strategy Preferred Options document. A copy of the officer's report is attached at Appendix B.
- 2.2 It was noted that revising the Council's Core Strategy document to take account of representations received and Go-East advice to provide more details of development locations and more empirical advice to support the preferred options would significantly improve the likelihood of the Core Strategy being deemed sound by the Planning Inspectorate.
- 2.3 It was also noted that a sustainability assessment of all housing solutions proposed to the Council via the various representations received, including the Conservative Group's proposals, would be conducted on a site by site basis. A range of issues would be considered, including accessibility, implications for local businesses, schools and hierarchy of settlement. This would enable the Council to build up a sound evidence base and to make direct comparisons of sites. It was anticipated that a revised consultation document would be considered by the Council next spring.
- 2.4 The Sub-Committee agreed that it was important to stress to residents that there was a real demand for new homes from people who had grown up in the District and wanted to remain; the proposed new housing was not in order to accommodate an influx of newcomers to the District. Although the District was large, there was a lot of land that was unsuitable for housing.
- 2.5 Members stressed the merit of looking closely at development sites during 2007 – 2021 in respect of developer contributions towards infrastructure and in setting a standard relating to quality of design in order to ensure that the developments were of a high standard which would enhance the District.

- 2.6 The Sub-Committee was concerned that there was likely to be insufficient Government funding for the infrastructure required to support so much additional housing. It was emphasised that much of the District did not enjoy good communications, which made it less attractive for businesses. A large portion of the District's workforce already commuted outside the District. It was felt that, on balance, it was best that the District Council should determine where new housing should be built within the District rather than this being determined centrally without the benefit of valuable local knowledge.
- 2.7 It was noted that emerging advice from the Government and the Planning Inspectorate indicated that some analysis of housing allocations would have to be contained within the preferred options Core Strategy document.
- 2.8 The Sub-Committee was concerned that there was an increasing need for bungalows, given the ageing population within the District, which it would probably not be possible to meet, given the large housing densities required for the limited land within the District. It was clear that land costs would increase, making the prices of bungalows prohibitive. Officers advised that the provision of suitable housing for the lifetime of occupants would be addressed by means of the Lifetime Home Standards, which the Council had signed up to via the Local Area Agreement.
- 2.9 It is proposed that the Executive Board **RESOLVES**
- That a revised Core Strategy Preferred Options document be prepared, having regard to the results of recent community involvement and an improved evidence base. (HPT)

Sarah Fowler

Head of Information and Customer Services

Background Papers:-

None.

For further information please contact Michelle Power or Sonia Worthington on:-

Tel:- 01702 318179

01702 318141

E-Mail:- michelle.power@rochford.gov.uk

sonia.worthington@rochford.gov.uk

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

URBAN CAPACITY STUDY

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report brings the production of an updated Urban Capacity Study (UCS) to the attention of Members and seeks their approval for the results of the study to be considered as part of the evidence base for the Council's Local Development Framework. A copy of the UCS has been circulated to all Members.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The UCS is an update of a previous UCS prepared for the Council in 2000. This revised and updated UCS builds upon information in the previous study and uses empirical evidence and analysis of historical trends to make revised projections.
- 2.2 As the updated UCS was completed, revised guidance on undertaking Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments was published by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). This guidance supersedes previous advice and suggests that urban capacity studies be replaced with new Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments. The relationship between the Council's UCS and DCLG guidance is examined in Appendix 1 to this report.

3 ISSUES AND OPTIONS RAISED

- 3.1 The UCS examines a variety of potential sources of residential development in the District. A constrained capacity for the differing sources has been determined and, in cases involving specific sites, the probability of the site coming forward has been estimated.
- 3.2 The UCS does not state a single figure for the urban capacity of the district – instead it lists projected capacities having regard to a number of differing potential scenarios. The realisation of the various scenarios will be dependent on a number of factors including the market and human behaviour, but also on the future planning policies of the Council.
- 3.3 It is considered that scenario K is the most realistic assessment of the urban capacity for the district and, subject to Members' comments, it is proposed that this figure is used to calculate the requirement for the release of green field sites for housing development in the emerging development plan documents.
- 3.4 With regard to the analysis in Appendix 1, whilst it is disappointing that a detailed piece of work to comprehensively review and update the UCS has, in part, been almost immediately superseded by the publication of new guidance, it is nevertheless concluded that the UCS is a robust analysis that can be used to realistically assess the capacity of the urban areas of the

district to accommodate more housing development. As explained in Appendix 1, further work will be undertaken to align the analysis with the new DCLG methodology.

4 RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Failure to have an up-to-date evidence base in place for the Local Development Plan may lead to future Development Plan Documents being found unsound by the Planning Inspectorate.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Failure to have an up-to-date evidence base in place may lead to Development Plan Documents being found unsound by the Planning Inspectorate and the Council failing to comply with the timetable laid out in the Local Development Scheme. This will affect the award of Planning Delivery Grant and would require the reproduction of the relevant Development Plan Documents.

6 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 It is proposed that the Sub-Committee **RECOMMENDS**

- (1) That the Urban Capacity Study 2007 be adopted as part of the evidence base for the production of the Council's Local Development Framework.
- (2) That scenario K be adopted as the most realistic assessment on which to base calculations for green field housing requirements.
- (3) That further work be undertaken to align the UCS with the new Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment methodology.

Shaun Scrutton

Head of Planning & Transportation

Background Papers:-

None.

For further information please contact Sam Hollingworth on:-

Tel:- 01702 318102

E-Mail:- samuel.hollingworth@rochford.gov.uk

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

APPENDIX 1

Relationship between the Urban Capacity Study and the DCLG's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments Practice Guidance**Introduction**

In 2007 the Council commenced work on updating the 2000 Urban Capacity Study as part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework (LDF). The updated document – the Urban Capacity Study 2007 (UCS) – was finalised in July 2007.

In July 2007 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) issued guidance on producing Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments which superseded previous guidance (Tapping the Potential – Assessing urban housing capacity: towards better practice).

The purpose of this note is to examine how the Council's UCS relates to the new guidance issued, and whether the UCS can be considered part of a sound evidence base.

In producing the UCS, the Council was aware that previous guidance was outdated and that empirical evidence from within the district showed that the guidance was flawed. This is explained in detail within the UCS itself. As such, the UCS does not follow previous guidance to the letter. In any case, the guidance issued by the then DETR makes clear it was never intended to be used in such a way.

New guidance and the UCS compared

The new guidance lists the following as the primary purposes of a strategic housing land availability assessment:

- Identify sites with potential for housing
- Assess their housing potential
- Assess when they are likely to be developed

The UCS examines a variety of possible sources of housing land, assesses their potential, and makes a judgement as to the probability of the site coming forward in the plan period. As such the UCS covers the three primary purposes of assessments as set out in guidance.

The UCS also provides the minimum core outputs as listed in figure 1 on page 7 of the practice guidance which are as follows:

-
- A list of sites, cross-referenced to maps showing locations and boundaries of specific sites (and showing broad locations, where necessary).
 - Assessment of the deliverability/developability of each identified site (ie in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability) to determine when an identified site is realistically expected to be developed.
 - Potential quantity of housing that could be delivered on each identified site or within each identified broad location (where necessary) or on windfall sites (where justified).
 - Constraints on the delivery of identified sites.
 - Recommendations on how these constraints could be overcome and when.

The guidance recommends that assessments should identify sufficient sites for at least the first 10 years of the plan period, and that where it is not possible to identify sufficient sites assessments should provide the evidence base to support judgements around broad locations. The Council's UCS has taken a slightly different approach. As it has examined all known potential sources of housing land and examined their suitability, but it has not provided guidance on appropriateness of other general locations to meet the housing requirements. Given that the only other sites that have not been examined within the assessment are predominantly Green Belt sites, often with other constraints, it is not considered appropriate for the UCS to attempt to determine possible Green Belt release locations at such an early stage. It would be more appropriate to take a more holistic approach, using the UCS in conjunction with other evidence and data available such as the housing needs survey, historic characterisation report, the forthcoming local wildlife sites review and others, together with extensive community and stakeholder involvement.

The UCS builds upon the previous study carried out in 2000 together with empirical data to produce estimates for the provision of residential development from non-site specific sources. As the methodology and justification for this is stated in the UCS, it is considered to be in line with DCLG guidance.

The production process for the UCS was broadly as DCLG is now recommending. One difference is that the DCLG recommends that a partnership approach be utilised in the development of assessments. Figure 2 on page 7 lists the process requirements for an assessment as follows:

- The survey and assessment should involve key stakeholders including house builders, social landlords, local property agents and local communities. Other relevant agencies may include the Housing Corporation and English Partnerships (a requirement in areas where they are particularly active).
- The methods, assumptions, judgments and findings should be discussed and agreed upon throughout the process in an open and transparent way, and explained in the assessment report. The report should include an explanation as to why particular sites or areas have been excluded from the assessment.

Planning worked with the Council's own economic development officer in the production of the UCS, and took into account NLUD data from English Partnerships and recent action on the part of landowners in considering whether sites were likely to come forward. There was, as such, stakeholder involvement to a degree, but not as significant an amount as DCLG now recommends. DCLG recommends the involvement of stakeholders such as English Partnerships, house builder, local property agents and local communities at the outset of the process. This is clearly now not possible, but the UCS will be continually assessed as part of the Annual Monitoring Report and it will be possible to involve other stakeholders at this time.

Conclusion

It is a matter of fact that, as guidance on producing assessments, Local Development Documents etc are being constantly produced and amended, it will not be possible for all of the Council's documents at any one time to be perfectly inline with the most recent guidance on their production. Notwithstanding this, and despite the UCS being developed prior to the practice guidance on such assessments being published, many of the elements promoted in the guidance are included in the UCS.

Certain elements which are absent can either be rectified in future reviews when carried out, are not appropriate for Rochford District due to specific local circumstances, or will be examined in other evidence base documents (for example, the Council's 'call for sites' exercise) or as part of production of Development Plan Documents.

The one omission from the UCS which is not so simple to overcome is that of involvement of certain stakeholders at the beginning of the process. It is not felt that this, on its own, renders the UCS invalid. The UCS will not sit as a standalone piece of evidence, but as part of an evidence base comprises numerous sources of information including that from the Council's 'call-for-sites' which involved the Council obtaining information regarding which land developers, land-owners and agents were keen to develop for residential purposes through consultation with these groups.

Having regard to the above, the UCS can still be viewed as a valid component of the Council's evidence base which should be given consideration in the production of Local Development Documents and reviewed as part of the Annual Monitoring Report.

ROCHFORD CORE STRATEGY - PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 In June and July 2007, the draft Core Strategy was subjected to 6 weeks of consultation, which included a series of public participation events, letters to statutory consultees and those registered on a database, school workshops, and information on the Council's website. A key conclusion from the consultation is that a further round of public consultation would be appropriate before the preparation of the submission version of the plan.
- 1.2 Nevertheless, the large number of responses made to the draft is to be welcomed, and will be used to inform the preparation of a revised draft of the Core Strategy. This report summarises the main points emerging from the consultation.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 As part of the new Local Development Framework the Council is required to produce a Core Strategy. This document will set out the general approach and strategy for the development of the District up to 2021.
- 2.2 The Core Strategy is produced in three stages: the Initial Issues and Options; the Preferred Options and Submission. After analysing the results of public participation, the sustainability appraisal and strategic environmental assessment of the Initial Issues and Options draft, the Council produced its Preferred Options draft and went out to public consultation on the document in accordance with Regulation 26 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations.
- 2.3 Having regard to the results of community involvement and other assessments, such as the sustainability appraisal, the next stage would be for the Council to prepare a Submission version of the Core Strategy to include the detailed policies and proposals necessary to implement the preferred options. As the name suggests, this draft would be submitted to the Secretary of State and undergo a public examination arranged by the Planning Inspectorate. At the submission stage, there will be further opportunity for public involvement through participation in the examination process.
- 2.4 However, the submission stage is limited to an assessment of the 'tests of soundness', and no further 'policy' or 'allocation' changes can be considered. Once the public examination is complete the Planning Inspectorate will decree that either the document is sound, sound subject to changes, or is unsound. In the case of the document being found to be sound or sound subject to changes the Council may then formally adopt the Core Strategy. If the Core Strategy is found to be unsound the Council will have to revise the document,

almost inevitably, depending on the outcome of the examination, having to return to a much earlier stage in the production process.

- 2.5 That being the case, it is essential that the earlier issues and options and preferred options stages are supported by sufficient detail and empirical data to explain the rationale for the submission version and to ensure the public examination confirms the proposals to be sound.

3 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- 3.1 In June and July the Council undertook a variety of community involvement exercises on the Core Strategy Preferred Options. These ensured that the Council not only met the minimum requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations, but exceeded them, as per the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
- 3.2 The Council utilised its new online consultation system for the first time for consultation on the Core Strategy. The system allows respondents to submit and view comments online, and enables the Council to analyse large volumes of correspondence more effectively. A link to the system was placed on the main page of the Council's website, along with a rolling banner promoting the opportunity to participate.
- 3.3 Those on the Council's Local Development Framework mailing list – which comprises statutory consultees along with groups and organisations who may have interest in the development of the District, and members of the public who have requested to be kept updated with opportunities to participate – were written to informing them of the consultation period and encouraging them to submit views using the online system. Groups written to inviting comment included those representing sections of the society who have traditionally been underrepresented in the planning process. Mindful that the over-reliance on electronic communication may exclude some sections of society, the opportunity to comment via written correspondence was also made available.
- 3.4 Notices were published in local papers and a press release was issued via the Council's Corporate Communications Officer.
- 3.5 Public exhibitions / meetings were staged at various locations across the District, primarily on evenings and weekends, in order to cater for those who do not normally have the opportunity to talk to Council Officers during office hours. Information available at the public exhibition was exactly as available in Rochford Council Offices, Rayleigh Civic Suite and online on the Council's website.
- 3.6 Notwithstanding information on display at the exhibitions being available from a variety of sources, there appeared to be a false expectation amongst many of those attending the exhibitions that additional information would be available there and / or they would miss out on an opportunity to participate if

they did not attend. This caused some confusion and frustration for members of the public and is a lesson to be learned in connection with the new process. The nature of the Core Strategy does not lend itself easily to public participation as people generally were more interested in detailed allocations, which is not the intended purpose of the document.

- 3.7 The volume of people attending the exhibitions varied from venue to venue, with some unexpectedly high turnouts in certain locations. Attendance in most, but not all, areas was considerably higher than at the last round of consultation. This was, it is believed, partly due to the Council learning from the previous stage and improving publicity for the events and also from increased media interest. In Rayleigh, where there was a particular concern that the exhibition event venue and timing would not meet the demand, the Council attempted to rectify this by inserting an additional exhibition into the schedule and by promoting the alternative sources from which information on display at the exhibitions was available. Although most events were held in the evening or at weekends, and times and locations varied, concern was still expressed by the public that they would be unable to attend events and that there was only one or two events in each area.
- 3.8 Having regard to the above, further consideration will need to be given to the choice of venues and timings. In the staging of future participation events the use of un-staffed static exhibitions alongside staffed exhibitions / meetings will be utilised. This will allow for exhibitions to be staged for longer – up to as long as the whole consultation period if required – thereby increasing the number of people reached. The Area Committee system will also be utilised. However, it is recognised that whatever mix of methods and formats is utilised, it will be difficult to meet all public expectations and requirements. Nonetheless, the communication network now in place is certainly more extensive in terms of providing community information and access.
- 3.9 In addition to being encouraged to submit formal representations on the Core Strategy, the public and other stakeholders were invited to join the Council's Local Development Framework mailing list so that they could be kept updated with development in planning policy and opportunities to submit comments.
- 3.10 Public participation exercises at the Preferred Options stage should not be seen purely as a means of generating formal submissions. A number of other benefits have arisen, including the following:-
- An increase in people joining the Council's Local Development Framework mailing list;
 - Raising awareness of the Local Development Framework and the changes the District will be facing. Although many members of the public appeared disappointed that the Core Strategy does not deal with detailed planning proposals it is hoped that the raising of issues at the events will help to generate community involvement in subsequent

Development Plan Documents which do address more specific aspects of planning policy; and

- Publicity around the Core Strategy consultation has encouraged hitherto unidentified community groups and mechanisms to make themselves known to the planning department and thus enable involvement in the production of future Development Plan Documents.

4 CONSULTATION RESULTS

- 4.1 The results gleaned from community involvement exercises build upon, and should be considered alongside, those obtained from public participation on the previous stage of the Core Strategy.
- 4.2 A total of 793 representations were submitted by 443 groups, organisations and members of the public. 151 (19%) were submitted to the Council directly through the new online consultation system; 186 (23.5%) via email; and 456 (57.5%) were paper representations.
- 4.3 Details of all representations received are available to view online via the Council's consultation system and in paper format available in the Member's Library in the Civic Suite.
- 4.4 In addition to the representations received a petition with 328 signatures was submitted at the Hullbridge public exhibition. The petition stated "Please all support your village, sign below if you are opposed to the amount of building houses/flats in our village. We need more shops for the village."
- 4.5 A statistical breakdown of representations received is attached to this report as Appendix 1.
- 4.6 The issue that by far and away elicited the most responses was that of the location and numbers of new housing. 459 representations related to this issue, 327 of which were objections, 114 comments and 18 in support. A large proportion of representations on this section were people objecting to additional development in their area of residence, the majority of which were objections to the allocation for Rayleigh, or respondents promoting development on particular sites.
- 4.7 A detailed analysis of the qualitative aspects of the consultation results together with Officer comments on these will be presented to Members at a future date.
- 4.8 Representations from both members of the public, statutory bodies and other organisations expressed concern regarding the lack of detail as to where new development will be located, the quality of the evidence base used to arrive at the preferred options, and the impact on infrastructure from new development.

- 4.9 When the drafting of the Core Strategy Preferred Options was originally undertaken, guidance inferred that the Core Strategy should not deal with specific development locations – this being left for the Allocations Development Plan Document – but should instead deal with broad issues and set out the Council's general approach to future development. However, responses from statutory consultees, including GO East, suggest that more detail is required at the Core Strategy Preferred Options stage than was provided in the Council's draft.
- 4.10 Comments from GO East suggest there is a high risk that if the Council were to proceed to Submission Stage from this Preferred Options draft the Core Strategy would ultimately be found unsound. In addition, a report published by the Planning Inspectorate in June 2007, explains the importance of ensuring that evidence is complete on the submission of the plan.
- 4.11 Public participation events have shown that there is clearly considerable public interest and concern regarding the future development of the District.
- 4.12 It is considered that a revision of the draft Core Strategy to include greater detail of development locations and empirical evidence to support the preferred options would not only enhance the prospects of the Core Strategy ultimately being found to be sound by the Planning Inspectorate, but it would allow the Council to take account of issues raised following community involvement, prior to moving to a submission version of the plan. The public and other stakeholders would then be consulted again on the revised Preferred Options draft, allowing more opportunity for public participation before submission. Although there is public participation at Submission Stage, opportunities for stakeholders to put forward alternatives are limited.
- 4.13 Since there will be a delay in the preparation of the submission version of the Core Strategy, it will be necessary to consider a revision to the Local Development Scheme (LDS) timetable; a report will be prepared for consideration at a future meeting of the sub-committee.

5 RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 If the Council were to proceed to Submission Stage without first going through the Preferred Options Stage again there would be a high probability that the Core Strategy would be found unsound by the Planning Inspectorate during the examination. The Council would subsequently be required to reproduce the Core Strategy, possibly having to recommence at the beginning of the entire process, with considerable resource implications. The adoption of the Core Strategy would then be put back a considerable amount of time. This would consequently cause a delay in the production and adoption of the other Development Plan Documents – such as Development Control Policies and Allocations – as these are required to conform to the Core Strategy. This would further delay the production of the Local Development Framework and may have implications on the awarding of Planning Delivery Grant to the

Council. In addition, it could also undermine the Council's control of development in the District. For example, by failing to be able to demonstrate an adequate housing supply to meet the requirements of the Regional Spatial Strategy, the Council may find it harder to successfully reject unwelcome, ad-hoc development proposals through the Development Control process.

- 5.2 Failure to revisit the Core Strategy Preferred Options stage would limit opportunities for effective public participation in the process and would be detrimental to community involvement in the planning of the District.
- 5.3 It must be noted that revisiting the Core Strategy Preferred Options will cause further delays to the Local Development Framework timetable, and may reduce the amount of Planning Delivery Grant awarded to the Council. Delays would not, however, be as significant as if the Council were to proceed to submission and then have the Core Strategy found to be unsound.

6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The Core Strategy will have a significant impact on shaping the District's future environment.

7 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The production of a revised Core Strategy Preferred Options document and subsequent community involvement exercises, will be largely undertaken by the Council's Planning Policy Team. However, resources will be required to prepare additional baseline reports, including a retail study, pitch/open space provision, and sustainability appraisal and environmental assessment of the revised document. The costs of this work can currently be met from Planning Delivery Grant.
- 7.2 The delay in producing the submission version of the Core Strategy requires a revision to the LDS timetable and this may impact on the award of Planning Delivery Grant.

8 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 It is proposed that the Sub-Committee **RECOMMENDS**

That a revised Core Strategy Preferred Options document be prepared, having regard to the results of recent community involvement, and an improved evidence base.

Shaun Scrutton

Head of Planning and Transportation

Background Papers:-

Local Development Frameworks: Lessons Learnt Examining Development Plan Documents, The Planning Inspectorate, June 2007.

For further information please contact Sam Hollingworth on:-

Tel:- 01702 318102

E-Mail:- samuel.hollingworth@rochford.gov.uk

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

APPENDIX 1

Statistical breakdown of Core Strategy Preferred Options representations

Section	Representations	Object	Support	Comment
Foreword	2	1 (50%)	0	1 (50%)
Spatial Portrait	15	0	0	15 (100%)
Spatial Vision	23	0	2 (9%)	21 (81%)
The Relationships of Documents	8	0	0	8 (100%)
Core Strategy Issues	8	1 (13%)	0	7 (88%)
Core Strategy Introduction	11	3 (27%)	0	8 (73%)
The Green Belt and Strategic Gaps between Settlements	75	16 (21%)	10 (13%)	49 (65%)
Protection and Enhancement of the Upper Roach Valley	13	0	4 (31%)	9 (69%)
Protection and Enhancement of Special Landscapes, Habitats and Species	15	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	9 (60%)
Housing Numbers and Phasing	57	12 (21%)	5 (9%)	40 (70%)
General Development Locations	402	315 (78%)	13 (3%)	74 (18%)
Affordable Housing	28	5 (18%)	2 (7%)	21 (75%)
Employment	20	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	18 (90%)
Good Design and Design Statements	22	1 (5%)	5 (23%)	16 (73%)
Character of Place and the Historic Environment	17	0	4 (24%)	13 (76%)
Landscaping	11	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	8 (73%)
Energy and Water Conservation and Renewable Energy	26	5 (19%)	3 (12%)	18 (69%)
Compulsory Purchase and Planning Obligations	15	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	11 (73%)
Community, Leisure and Tourism Facilities	20	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	16 (80%)
Implementation and Monitoring	5	1 (20%)	0	4 (80%)

All percentages have been rounded up to the nearest integer