
Representations to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (Second Deposit Draft)

August 2004

EO&SC Appendix 2



**Rochford District
Council**

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE ROCHFORD DISTRICT REPLACEMENT LOCAL PLAN (SECOND DEPOSIT) DRAFT

Please note:

- All objections made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) remain in force, unless formally withdrawn.
- The text shown in the recommendations shows the approved text as normal. Any additions to this are shown as underlined text and any deletions are shown as ~~struckthrough~~ text.

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
1 – Introduction & Objectives	CS1	Moving towards sustainable development
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – continues to offer its support for this policy.		
42 – English Nature – the respondent continues to offer their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
None		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
CS1 - MOVING TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT The local planning authority will improve and enhance the environmental wealth of the district by requiring development to be undertaken in the most environmentally, socially and economically sustainable way.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
1 – Introduction & Objectives	CS3	Reducing the need to travel
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – continues to offer its support for this policy.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>80 - GO-East – the respondent states that ‘may’ does not provide any certainty in the policy and should be replaced by ‘will’.</p> <p>133 – House Builders Federation – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree with GO-East and amend as shown below.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>CS3 - REDUCING THE NEED TO TRAVEL</p> <p>Development that seeks to reduce the length, number and duration of motorised journeys (particularly at peak hours) and that encourages the use of alternative modes of transport to help protect the quality of the built and urban environment may<u>will</u> be permitted.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
1 – Introduction and Objectives	1.37	Encouraging economic regeneration
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
104 - English Heritage - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
This was the only representation received on this paragraph and it will now proceed unchallenged into the final plan.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>1.13 Economic development includes the supply of employment land, the pattern of employment growth and the supply of labour and the skills of the workforce. The first two of these factors can be addressed through local plan policies. Linking with other areas of the core strategy, the Council recognizes that regeneration can also be conservation-led as evidenced in the document <i>Heritage Dividend</i>¹.</p>		

¹ *Heritage Dividend* (2003), English Heritage.

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
1 – Introduction & Objectives	CS6	Promoting good design and design statements
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
95 – Barratt Eastern Counties – the respondent offers their support for this policy. 104 - English Heritage - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No further comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>CS6 - PROMOTING GOOD DESIGN AND DESIGN STATEMENTS</p> <p>The local planning authority will only approve development proposals that demonstrate good quality design which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Takes into account the existing form and character of the site and its surroundings; b. Relates to the locality in terms of scale, layout, proportion, materials and detailing; c. Includes landscaping arrangements which reduce the visual impact of and positively enhance the proposal and its surroundings; and d. Minimises the risk of crime. <p>Development proposals will need to be supported by design statements in the circumstances set out in LPSPG5.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
1 – Introduction and Objectives	1.57 <i>et seq</i>	Emphasising the value of landscaping
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
145 – Rayleigh Civic Society – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>1.57 The local planning authority is committed to both maintaining and enhancing environmental quality in the district. To this end, developments must contain a well considered and high quality landscape content, which can be properly and cost effectively maintained. Many developments requiring planning permission are enhanced by the inclusion of hard and/or soft landscaping - particularly new build or refurbishment. This is an integral and important design factor as relevant in considering an application as land use, siting, access and architectural design.</p> <p>1.58 The landscape treatment of development sites is considered to be essential in order to integrate new development into its surroundings, improve the landscape character and appearance of a site and to fulfil the site's landscape potential. Landscape planning should be regarded as an integral part of the design process. Too often schemes are prepared for the buildings and roads before any consideration is given to the rest of the landscape. Consequently, landscaping elements are often poorly thought out, inappropriate to the particular area and opportunities to enhance the landscape may be lost.</p> <p>1.59 In particular, proposals for new development should demonstrate that sufficient space is made for the introduction of new replacement trees, and the routes for service trenches should be clearly shown. It is to the advantage of the developer to treat the environmental aspects of the proposed development seriously and to take professional advice where necessary to comply with this and other local plan policies.</p> <p>1.60 The local planning authority believes it is no longer acceptable to agree, or postpone by condition, landscaping details until after planning permission has been granted. This will enable the planning application to be progressed more effectively and increase the likelihood of a quick and favourable decision. Where environmental aspects are not well considered, delays may be experienced due to the negotiation of amendments, or a refusal.</p> <p>1.61 The local planning authority will also use planning obligations under the <i>Town and Country Planning Act</i> (1990) to seek appropriate environmental improvements where these are necessary to support proposed development. Appropriate environmental improvements will include the provision of landscaping and open space of a size and layout appropriate to the development.</p>		

CHAPTER	PLANNING OBJECTIVE	TITLE
2 – Housing	HO3	
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
180 – Hockley Parish Council – the respondent objects to the objective which it believes places greater emphasis on <i>new build</i> rather than the retention of existing stock.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The representation is duly noted, but this is not the intention of the objective.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
HO3 To deliver a mix of house types and tenures that best meet the needs of the districts' population		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
2 - Housing	2.4	Structure Plan requirements
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
85 – Ms G Yeadell – the respondent seeks clarification between the text of this paragraph and a speech made by the Head of Planning Services on development in the Thames Gateway.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
This replacement local plan is being prepared in accordance with the provisions of the adopted structure plan. The consideration of any future requirements for housing land allocations emerging from RPG14, which it unlikely to be formally adopted until 2006 will be part of the preparation of the Rochford Local Development Framework which will supersede the local plan in due course.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
2.4 The Structure Plan makes no attempt to allocate or require land to be safeguarded for residential development beyond 2011. Instead, the plan makes clear that housing provision post 2011 will be considered by a review of the plan in the context of new regional planning guidance (RPG14 Regional Planning Guidance for the East of England). Therefore, this local plan, as explained in housing objective HO1, makes no provision for housing post 2011. Future allocations will be dependent then on the outcome of a review of a review of the Structure Plan.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 – Housing	HP1	Overall Housing Provision
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>26 – Powergen – are supportive of this policy which allows residential development within the existing residential areas, as defined on the proposals maps.</p> <p>80 – GO-East – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>180 – Hockley Parish Council – the respondent objects to the policy of accepting the sub-division of residential properties. They maintain that despite the caveats attached and the supporting text that there is insufficient emphasis on the protection of residential amenity in the policy.</p> <p>205 – M Giles – the respondent wishes that his land adjacent to Bull Lane in Rayleigh be added to the overall housing allocation.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The sub-division of existing large dwellings can make a useful contribution to the overall housing requirements of the district. The Council will assess proposals for sub-division against the provisions of Policy HP16.</p> <p>The draft local plan allocates sufficient land to fulfil the housing requirements set out in the adopted Structure Plan for the period to 2011. Thereafter, the requirement for consideration to be given to the allocation of any land to fulfil future housing needs will be dependent on the provisions set out in the finally approved version of RPG14. It is not expected that the final version of RPG14 will be approved until 2006.</p> <p>The implications of the housing and employment land allocations emerging from RPG14 will be taken into account in the preparation of the Rochford LDF, to be prepared between 2005 and 2008. Therefore, the consideration of the release of any land for future housing development, beyond that identified in the current local plan, is premature. In any event, the policy simply states the planning authority's intention to ensure that sufficient land is identified to fulfil the structure plan allocation.</p> <p>The proposal for release of land adjacent to Bull Lane, Rayleigh is not supported. Additional land is not required for housing development in the period to 2011, and it would be wholly inappropriate for there to be any ad hoc allocations of land in the local plan, even if it were to be argued that such land could make a contribution towards a future housing total in a draft RPG14 that has some considerable way to go before being approved.</p> <p>Once the final version of RPG14 is published, the Council will be in a position to prepare a Local Development Document dealing with housing. This will carefully assess the options and requirements for future housing set against a backdrop of sustainable environmental appraisal, updated urban capacity studies and the implications for the Green Belt.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		

No change:

POLICY HP1 – OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION

Provision is made for 3050 dwellings net in the district between 1996 and 2011, and to achieve that provision residential development will be permitted within the settlements shown on the Proposals Map. Within these settlements encouragement will be given to residential intensification, sub-division of dwellings, the re-use of vacant, redundant or underused land and living over the shop in accordance with the relevant policies in this Plan and the LPA's adopted supplementary planning guidance.

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 – Housing	HP2	Housing site allocation
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>105 – Westbury Homes – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>128 – Property Spy – the respondent argues that land at Wakering Road, Southend should be included in the policy.</p> <p>137 – CPREssex - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>143 – Sport England – the respondent is concerned that the policy does not make provision of a replacement pitch a prior requirement to losing the existing site for Rochford Primary School.</p> <p>148 – Ashingdon Parish Council - the respondent offers their support for this policy, now that Stambridge Mills has been deleted from the allocation.</p> <p>189 – Associated British Foods Plc – the respondent objects to the deletion of Stambridge Mills from the housing allocation.</p> <p>211 – Mr K Russell – the respondent wishes to see their land (at 155 Greensward Lane, Hockley) be allocated for housing purposes.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The draft local plan allocates sufficient land to fulfil the housing requirements set out in the adopted Structure Plan for the period to 2011. Thereafter, the requirement for consideration to be given to the allocation of any land to fulfil future housing needs will be dependent on the provisions set out in the finally approved version of RPG14. It is not expected that the final version of RPG14 will be approved until 2006.</p> <p>The implications of the housing and employment land allocations emerging from RPG14 will be taken into account in the preparation of the Rochford LDF, to be prepared between 2005 and 2008. Therefore, the consideration of the release of any land for future housing development, beyond that identified in the current local plan, is premature.</p> <p>The proposals for the release of land at Wakering Road and 155 Greensward Lane, Hockley are not supported. Additional land is not required for housing development in the period to 2011, and it would be wholly inappropriate for there to be any ad hoc allocations of land in the local plan, even if it were to be argued that such land could make a contribution towards a future housing total in a draft RPG14 that has some considerable way to go before being approved.</p> <p>Once the final version of RPG14 is published, the Council will be in a position to prepare a Local Development Document dealing with housing. This will carefully assess the options and requirements for future housing set against a backdrop of sustainable environmental appraisal, updated urban capacity studies and the implications for the Green Belt.</p> <p>The point made by Sport England is noted but, in fact, the new sports pitch has been provided behind Rochford County Primary as a replacement for the existing pitch on the west side of Ashingdon Road.</p> <p>Stambridge Mills – the allocation of Stambridge Mills for Class B1, business development better reflects the historic use of the site.</p>		

RECOMMENDATION

No change:

POLICY HP2 – HOUSING SITE ALLOCATION

Provision is made for new dwellings to be built on development sites as follows:

	Site	Est. Capacity
i	Reads Nursery, Rawreth Lane, Rayleigh	72
ii	Barons Court Kennels, Rawreth Lane, Rayleigh	24
iii	Park School, Rawreth Lane, Rayleigh (see note a)	120
iv	Playing Fields, Rochford County Primary School. Ashingdon Road, Rochford (see note b)	25
v	Main Road, Hawkwell (see note c)	36

- a. *The capacity calculation for Park School is based on a total of 2.4Ha (6 acres) of land being released for market housing and 0.4Ha (1 acre) for housing for key workers.*
- b. *The development of this site is dependent on the provision of a new playing field for the school. Flood mitigation measures may also be required.*
- c. *This allocation relates to an area of land currently allocated for industrial development at the southern end of Hawkwell, for which policies EB2 and EB5 may also have significant implications.*

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 – Housing	HP3	Density of Development
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy.</p> <p>70 – Swan Hill Homes – object to this policy as it does not accurately reflect the guidance in paragraphs 54 and 58 of Planning Policy Guidance Note 3.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>85 – Ms G Yeadell – the respondent objects to this policy as it would lead to the demolition of existing stock to ensure densities could be reached.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>Whilst the comments from Swan Hill are noted, the Government Office has now withdrawn its objection to the wording of the original policy. It is considered that the wording does now reflect the requirements set out in PPG3.</p> <p>On the point made by Mrs Yeadell, the policy does not promote the demolition of existing housing stock. It is clear that many existing residential areas may not be at the densities specified in the policy, but the policy does not require demolition of such areas and their redevelopment.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY HP3 – DENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>The density of new residential development must be not less than 30 dwellings per hectare and best use of land will be achieved in the range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare (net). The character of individual sites and surroundings will determine the acceptable density but in town centres and areas with good transport links, higher densities above this range may be acceptable. As well as matters of design and layout and car parking standards explained in LPSPG1 and 2, the local planning authority will take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Landscape, ecological and topographical features; ii. The character and density of adjacent development; iii. The impact on residential amenity; and iv. The wider visual impact of a scheme. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 – Housing	HP4	Design Statements
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>61 – Environment Agency - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
There are no longer any objections to the proposed wording of Policy HP4.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY HP4 – DESIGN STATEMENTS</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority will require developers to prepare a design statement for all new housing schemes of more than 12 dwellings to be submitted with the planning application. All statements will be expected to outline the key design elements of the scheme and to provide an assessment against the principles of sustainable development outlined in this Plan, including impacts on biodiversity and nature conservation.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 – Housing	HP5	Infrastructure
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
<p>70 – Swan Hill Homes – the respondent considers the additional text ...or within an appropriate distance... to be ambiguous and requires clarification.</p> <p>78 – ECC (Schools Service) – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>80 - GO-East – the respondent states that the policy should set out the circumstances where planning obligations will be sought.</p> <p>180 – Hockley Parish Council – the respondent believes that it is <i>essential</i> to ensure that supporting infrastructure is in place and suggests this wording rather than ‘will explore’.</p>		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
<p>The requirements for infrastructure provision will be dependent on the characteristics and location of a development site. Therefore it is not realistic or practicable neither to specify those requirements in advance nor to be absolutely specific about the distance relationship between the improvements and the development site. For example, improvements to transportation infrastructure might be required immediately adjacent to a development site or some distance away.</p> <p>The wording of the policy is considered to make a very clear statement of intent about the provision of infrastructure where this is considered to be appropriate. It would not be appropriate to make a ‘blanket’ statement about the provision of infrastructure since in most cases requirements will vary and in some cases there may not be any identified requirement.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY HP5 - INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>Having regard to the advice as set out in national policy regarding Planning Obligations, the Local Planning Authority will explore all means at their disposal, including planning gain contributions from developers, to ensure the provision and phasing, where appropriate, within housing development sites or within an appropriate distance, of affordable housing, adequate shopping facilities, health care facilities, education facilities, transportation infrastructure (for buses and cycling in particular), nurseries, playgroups and minor infrastructure, including public telephone kiosks, and letter posting boxes.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 - Housing	HP6	Design and Layout
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – request the inclusion of nature conservation or biodiversity as a bulletpoint. 42 – English Nature – the policy should also make reference to policy CS6. 80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Policies in Chapter 8 of the Local Plan deal with development and nature conservation. There is no requirement to cross-reference policies in either the Local Plan or the Structure Plan.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change: POLICY HP6 – DESIGN AND LAYOUT The Local Planning Authority will expect new housing schemes and alterations/extensions to existing housing to be to a high standard of layout and design, taking into account the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility • Boundary treatment • Car parking • Density • Gardens, play space and other shared space • Impact on designated sites, Conservation Areas and listed buildings • Landscaping • Overlooking, privacy and visual amenity • Relationship to existing and nearby buildings • Scale and form Detailed advice on these issues is included in LPSPG1 – Housing Design and Layout, LPSPG2 – Car Parking Standards and the Essex Design Guide for Residential and Mixed Use Areas.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 - Housing	HP7	Energy Conservation
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – the respondent continues to offer their support for this policy.</p> <p>61 - Environment Agency – the respondent wishes to see the addition of water conservation to the first sentence of the policy.</p> <p>73 – RSPB – the respondent offers their support for this policy.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The words 'water conservation' can be added to the policy.		
RECOMMENDATION		
Amend Policy HP7 by the inclusion of the words 'water conservation':		
<p>POLICY HP7 – ENERGY CONSERVATION</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority will require developers to provide a statement of the measures that have been adopted to reduce the environmental impact of new housing schemes, including an assessment of building design, orientation, layout, landscaping, water supply, <u>water conservation</u> and drainage. The statement must be submitted at the same time as the planning application.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
2 - Housing	2.39	Commuted payments
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
89 – George Wimpey (East London) Ltd – the respondent states that the suggested mechanism for commuted sums is unacceptable and unreasonable. The suggest the deletion of the bulletpoints and leading text ...but the key elements will be:		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
This lower case text provides an explanation of the way in which agreement could be reached on the provision of a commuted sum in certain cases. It is absolutely essential for there to be a methodology for calculating the value of the contribution and the methodology outlined in the plan is reasonable and has been accepted by other developers.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>COMMUTED PAYMENTS</p> <p>2.39 In some cases, it may be inappropriate for the affordable housing contribution to be within a prospective development site. This may, for example, be the case where a scheme for elderly persons accommodation is proposed. In such cases, the Local Planning Authority will seek a commuted sum contribution from the developer to be put towards the provision of affordable housing in the district. The arrangements for calculating the sum to be provided will depend on the nature of the scheme, but the key elements will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment of the gross open market value of the units to be provided; • Total scheme cost (assuming land at £0); • Resulting subsidy – open market value minus scheme costs. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 - Housing	HP8	Affordable housing
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the reference to a threshold needs to be deleted.</p> <p>89 – George Wimpey (East London) Ltd – the respondent states that the justification for the threshold is not clear. Therefore the text after ...where the development is piecemeal... should be deleted.</p> <p>133 – House Builders Federation – the respondent believes that the plan should 'seek' commuted sums, rather than 'requiring' them.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The reference to the deletion of the threshold relates to the fact that a threshold is provided for provision of affordable housing, but a different threshold has been stated at the end of the policy for the payment of commuted sums. It is proposed to delete the last sentence of the policy.</p> <p>The change of words from 'required' to 'seek' is reasonable.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That Policy HP8 be amended by changing the word "require" in the third paragraph to 'seek' and by the deletion of the last sentence:</p> <p>POLICY HP8 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING</p> <p>In new residential development schemes of more than 25 dwellings or residential sites of 1 hectare or more, the Local Planning Authority will expect between 10% and 20% of the new dwellings to be provided as affordable housing to meet local needs.</p> <p>Arrangements will be required to ensure that the affordable housing is retained in perpetuity for the use of successive as well as initial occupiers: This will be best achieved through the involvement of a housing association. The developer will be expected to enter into an agreement with the authority under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the provision.</p> <p>In some cases, it will be inappropriate for the affordable housing provision to be within the development scheme, and in such cases, the Local Planning Authority will <u>seek</u> require the provision of a commuted sum towards off-site affordable housing in the district.</p> <p>Affordable housing or commuted sums will be required on composite sites or those sites where development is piecemeal, where the total development exceeds the 12 dwelling threshold.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 - Housing	HP9	Rural Exceptions
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comments.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY HP9 – RURAL EXCEPTIONS</p> <p>The LPA will consider proposals for the provision of affordable housing in rural areas subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. It being demonstrated that there is an identified local need; ii. It not being possible to satisfy these needs in any other way; iii. There being access to local services; and iv. The housing being legally available for local people in perpetuity; and v. The protection of biodiversity interests on and surrounding the site. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 - Housing	HP13	Mobility housing
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>89 – George Wimpey (East London) Ltd – the respondent states that the phrase ‘significant element’ does not provide certainty. The word ‘significant’ should be deleted.</p> <p>121 – BT plc – the respondent suggests that the policy is contrary to the provision of the Department of Environment (Housing Directorate) occasional paper 2/74.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>It is accepted that the use of the word ‘significant’ does not provide sufficient clarity.</p> <p>It is not accepted that the policy is in conflict with the paper ‘Housing for People with Disabilities’ published in 1974. In any event, it should be noted that this occasional paper was published more than 30 years ago and the local plan policy is seeking to make a difference in the accessibility of housing.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>Amend Policy HP13 by the deletion of the word ‘significant’:</p> <p>POLICY HP13 – MOBILITY HOUSING</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority will require developers to include the provision of <u>an</u> significant element of ‘lifetime’ mobility housing within new estates.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 - Housing	HP14	Backland development
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
42 – English Nature – object to the policy and suggest an additional criterion be added: v. The biodiversity interests of the site and surrounding areas with a view to protecting and enhancing those interests.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Policy NR4 specifically deals with biodiversity on new development sites, together with other policies on nature conservation and species protection included in chapter 8 of the Local Plan.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY HP14 – BACKLAND DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>In considering applications for the development of backland sites for housing purposes, the Local Planning Authority will have regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The need for a satisfactory and adequate means of access; ii. The relationship of new to existing buildings; iii. The scale and visual appearance of the proposed development; and iv. To the guidance in LPSPG1 and LPSPG2 on layout, design and parking standards. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 - Housing	HP17	Living over the shop
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
133 – House Builders Federation – the respondent states that they cannot see how the LPA can require the use of upper floors for this purpose.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The planning authority is keen to see accommodation above shop units fully utilised. However, the respondent is correct that in legal terms, the council cannot 'require' the use of upper floors as living accommodation. Therefore, it is accepted that the word 'require' should be replaced with the word 'encourage', which better reflects the ability of the planning authority to influence the situation.		
RECOMMENDATION		
Amend Policy HP17 by replacing the word 'require' with the word 'encourage':		
POLICY HP17 - LIVING OVER THE SHOP		
The Local Planning Authority will require <u>encourage</u> the use of the upper floors of shops and other commercial premises as self-contained living accommodation, except in cases where the accommodation would provide a poor living environment, by reason of its scale / layout, means of access, outlook or incompatibility with adjoining uses.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 - Housing	HP18	Safeguarding amenities
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
85 – Ms G Yeadell – the respondent objects to this policy as it is ...a cynical introduction by local developers.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The respondent's comments are noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
POLICY HP18 – SAFEGUARDING AMENITIES In order to safeguard amenities, proposals for development that will damage the character and appearance of residential areas will be refused, unless there are ameliorating circumstances associated with the proposed scheme.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
2 - Housing	HP22	Gypsy sites
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the policy intention lacks clarity and this is required otherwise the policy can be interpreted as an exceptions policy.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The comments from GO-East are not clear. In reality, it is considered that the policy provides a very clear framework against which to consider proposals for new Gypsy sites in the district.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY HP22 – GYPSY SITES</p> <p>Applicants must demonstrate that they have considered alternative non-green belt locations for their development. Once this is demonstrated, the local planning authority will have regard to the following criteria in considering applications made by Gypsies for private sites for settled occupation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Any opportunity thereby afforded to clear unauthorised sites; ii. The avoidance of disturbance, including disturbance at unsocial hours, affecting neighbouring land or premises; iii. The practicability of adequately screening (where accepted) any working or storage areas by establishing new or maintaining or reinforcing existing plantations or mounds; iv. The protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land, historic woodlands, ancient landscapes, wildlife habitats or areas designated for their special scientific interest; v. The adequacy of arrangements for access, for parking and manoeuvring of vehicles and (where appropriate) for the storage of goods and materials; vi. The availability of services; and vii. The arrangements made for securing the site in the event of its seasonal or other temporary periods of non-occupation. 		

CHAPTER	PLANNING OBJECTIVE	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	RI4	
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
85 – Ms G Yeadell – the respondent objects the omission of Ashingdon, Hockley and Hawkwell from the list in this planning objective.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
<p>Whilst there is some logic in the proponents’ arguments, the historical basis is not sound. Ashingdon has an historic collection of properties close to the Minster and Hockley has the same around its parish church. However, the residential development that forms modern day Hawkwell, Hockley and Ashingdon is either a form of coalescence or is a modern (Victorian or later). In any event the representation is not valid, as it refers to an objective that was not subject to challenge during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) or change thereafter.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>RI4 To preserve the character of the historic towns of Rochford and Rayleigh, and the villages of Great Wakering, Canewdon, Paglesham Eastend and Paglesham Churchend.</p>		

CHAPTER	PLANNING OBJECTIVE	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	RI5	
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
85 – Ms G Yeadell – the respondent objects to referring to neighbouring districts where the LPA has no control.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
The representation is not valid, as it refers to an objective that was not subject to challenge during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) or change thereafter.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
RI5 To promote the process of urban regeneration in settlements within Rochford District and within the urban areas of neighbouring districts.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	R1	Development within the green belt
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>31 – National Grid Transco – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>32 – EWT – the respondent offers their support for this policy.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>205 – M Giles – the respondent wishes that his land adjacent to Bull Lane in Rayleigh be added to the housing allocation and removed from the green belt.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The representations in support of this policy and those which have been withdrawn are duly noted. Those objections which remain relate to the inclusion of sites, which their proponents wish to see taken out of the green belt and made available for housing. Such piecemeal development as this would allow would not be sustainable and would not secure the long-term purposes or objectives of the green belt. It is therefore believed that no change should be made and that the sites should remain within the green belt.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY R1 - DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE GREEN BELT</p> <p>Within the Metropolitan Green Belt there is a general presumption against inappropriate development. Except in very special circumstances, planning permission will not be granted unless for:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Development required for agriculture or forestry in accordance with Policies R3, R4, R8 and R9; (ii) the extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings in accordance with the criteria defined in Policies R2, R5 and R6; (iii) limited affordable housing for local community needs within or immediately adjoining existing villages, in accordance with the criteria defined in Policy R3; (iv) essential small-scale facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation in accordance with PPG2; (v) the re-use or adaptation of existing buildings in accordance with the criteria defined in Policy R9; (vi) mineral extraction and related restoration; or, (vii) cemeteries, or other uses of land which fulfil the objectives of the Green Belt. <p>Development which may be permitted under this policy should preserve the openness of the Green Belt and should not conflict with the main purposes of including land within it. Any development which is permitted should be of a scale, design and siting such that the character of the countryside is not harmed and nature conservation interests are protected.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	R3	Agricultural and forestry dwellings
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY R3 - AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY DWELLINGS</p> <p>Within the Green Belt planning permission will be granted for permanent dwellings for agricultural and forestry workers provided that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) it is essential for the proper functioning of the enterprise for at least one person to be present on the holding at most times of the day and night; (ii) the functional need relates to a full-time agricultural / horticultural worker; (iii) the unit and the agricultural enterprise in question, have been established for at least three years, have been profitable for at least one of them, are currently financially sound and have every prospect of remaining so in the long term; (iv) the functional need could not be fulfilled by another dwelling on the unit, or any other accommodation in the area as a whole that is suitable for, and available to, the worker(s) concerned; (v) no dwelling or other building suitable for conversion to a dwelling has recently been sold or let by the applicant that would have otherwise met the functional need; and (vi) the size of the dwelling is commensurate with the established functional requirement of the unit. (Dwellings will normally be expected to be bungalows or chalets and should not, in any case, accommodate in excess of 140sq.m of habitable floorspace. If the applicant wishes the dwelling to incorporate the 35sq.m of additional floorspace allowed for under Policy R5 from the outset, the Local Planning Authority will impose a planning condition withdrawing permitted development rights to further extend the floorspace of the dwelling). <p>Permissions for new farm dwellings will be subject to conditions, <i>inter alia</i>, to restrict their occupation to persons solely or mainly employed, or last employed, in agriculture in the locality and remove permitted development rights in order to control their scale and appearance.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	R4	Temporary agricultural dwellings
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
This was the only representation received with regard to this policy. It may now proceed through to adoption.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY R4 - TEMPORARY AGRICULTURAL DWELLINGS</p> <p>Within the Green Belt planning permission will be granted for the stationing of mobile homes for agricultural workers provided that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) it is essential for the proper functioning of the enterprise for at least one person to be present on the holding at most times of the day and night; (ii) the functional need relates to a full-time agricultural / horticultural worker; (iii) there is clear evidence of a firm intention and ability to develop the enterprise concerned; (iv) there is clear evidence that the proposed enterprise has been planned on a sound financial basis; (v) no dwelling or other building suitable for conversion to a dwelling has recently been sold or let by the applicant that would have otherwise met the functional need; and (vi) the functional need could not be fulfilled by another dwelling on the unit, or any other accommodation in the area as a whole that is suitable for, and available to, the worker(s) concerned. <p>Permissions for mobile homes will be subject to conditions, <i>inter alia</i>, to restrict their occupation to persons solely or mainly employed, or last employed, in agriculture in the locality and require their removal from the holding after a maximum period of three years.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	R5	The extension of dwellings in the green belt
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
This was the only representation received with regard to this policy. It may now proceed through to adoption.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY R5 - THE EXTENSION OF DWELLINGS IN THE GREEN BELT Extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt outside the rural settlement areas defined in Policy R2 will be restricted in size. Planning permission will be granted for extensions provided that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the total size of the dwelling as extended will not exceed the original habitable floor space by more than 35 square metres in floor area; ii. the proposal does not involve a material increase in the overall height of the property; iii. the proposal does not harm the character of the countryside; iv. the proposal does not give rise to the formation of a self-contained unit of accommodation (e.g. a 'granny flat'); and v. all parts of the existing dwelling to remain after the extension(s) have been provided are structurally sound. <p>In permitting extensions in accordance with the above, the Local Planning Authority will, in appropriate cases, impose planning conditions to restrict the habitable floorspace of the property to that illustrated on the approved plans.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	R6	The replacement or rebuild of existing dwellings in the green belt
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
This was the only representation received with regard to this policy. It may now proceed through to adoption.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY R6 - THE REPLACEMENT OR REBUILD OF EXISTING DWELLINGS IN THE GREEN BELT</p> <p>The replacement or rebuild of existing dwellings in the Metropolitan Green Belt will be permitted taking account of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the total size of the new dwelling is no greater than: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) 35 square metres in floor area above the size of the habitable floorspace of the original dwelling; (B) the size of the original dwelling together with the maximum permitted development allowance provided for by Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995; or, (C) the size of the habitable floorspace of the dwelling lawfully existing at the time of the application; (ii) the condition of the original dwelling; (iii) the visual mass of the new dwelling should be no greater than that of the existing dwelling (taking into consideration any additional mass allowed for in respect of criterion (i)(A) or (B), above). The overall height of the replacement dwelling should not exceed that of the existing dwelling, unless a modest increase in height can be justified on design or visual amenity grounds. Where the existing dwelling is a bungalow it should be replaced by a bungalow; (iv) the replacement dwelling will be expected to be sited in the same location within the plot as the original, unless an alternative siting is perceived to be more appropriate in Green Belt or amenity terms; <u>and</u> (v) where resiting is agreed, arrangements are secured to ensure the demolition of the replaced dwelling and its outbuildings and the reinstatement of their site. <p>Planning conditions or legal agreements will be used in appropriate cases to prevent the erection of extensions to the dwelling or the conversion of roofspaces, garages, etc., to habitable floorspace.</p> <p>Proposals for the replacement or rebuild of dwellings sited within the rural settlement areas defined in Policy R2 will be considered on their merits having due regard to sections (ii) to (vi) of this policy.</p> <p>NOTE: The definition of certain terms used in the above policy is found at the foot of Policy R6.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	R7	Extension of domestic gardens
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – the respondent offers their support for part of this policy, but maintain their original objection to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft). 180 – Hockley Parish Council - the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The original representation made by the EWT would have required a hedge to be planted around garden extensions granted under this policy. However, such a requirement would have adverse impacts on the openness of the green belt and may not be in character with other parts of the landscape, particularly open coastal landscapes.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
POLICY R7 - THE EXTENSION OF DOMESTIC GARDENS The extension of domestic gardens into the Green Belt will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, where it can be clearly demonstrated that the proposal would not materially affect the openness of the Green Belt or prejudice the Council's Green Belt Strategy, set out above.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	R8	New agricultural buildings
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
<p>42 – English Nature - the respondent offers their support for this policy.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that this revision fails to take account of permitted development rights and therefore maintains their original objection to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft).</p>		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
The LPA notes the comments made by GO-East and the following change, taking into account permitted development rights, is suggested.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be amended as follows:</p> <p>POLICY R8 - NEW AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS</p> <p>Where planning permission is required, the Local Planning Authority will be Whilst being mindful of the operational requirements of new agricultural buildings, but the Local Planning Authority will refuse buildings which are of a design, external appearance and siting that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Has an adverse visual impact in the landscape or on features of nature conservation interest; and, ii. Fails to respect the character and appearance of nearby buildings. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	R9	Re-use / adaptation of existing rural buildings
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Despite the combination of the old policies R9 and R10 to form a more comprehensive policy, outstanding objection remain. As these are unlikely to be resolved as they relate to the thrust of policy, it is proposed to proceed with the policy unchanged.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY R9 - THE RE-USE AND ADAPTATION OF EXISTING RURAL BUILDINGS & FARM DIVERSIFICATION</p> <p>Within the Metropolitan Green Belt, the re-use of farm and other existing buildings in rural diversification schemes will be permitted, provided that the proposed use would complement the operations on the site. The re-use and adaptation of farm and other existing rural buildings will be permitted, provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the proposal relates to a building with a form, bulk and general design in keeping with its surroundings; ii. the proposal relates to a building of permanent and substantial construction, that is capable of conversion to the proposed use without major or complete reconstruction; iii. the proposal involves no major extensions which would materially affect the openness of the green belt the proposal involves no extension to the building, nor would any such extension be necessary in order to carry out the proposed use; iv. the proposed use of the building and associated land would not have a materially greater impact than the permitted / lawful use on the openness of the Green Belt or the fulfilment of its purposes; v. the proposed use would not introduce additional activity or traffic movements likely to materially and adversely affect the character of the Green Belt or place unacceptable pressures on the surrounding rural road network; vi. in the case of a change to residential use, the applicant has first made every reasonable attempt to secure a suitable business re-use during the two years prior to the application.; and vii. there is no detriment to nature conservation interests. <p>Where the conversion of a building to residential use is permitted, a planning condition will be imposed withdrawing permitted development rights to alter or extend the building. The residential conversion of listed farm buildings will not normally be permitted.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
3 – Rural Issues	R12	New cemeteries
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The representation received from GO-East has been dealt with. It is proposed to carry this policy forward as proposed previously.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY R12 - NEW CEMETERIES Permission will be granted for the provision of new cemeteries, or the extension of existing cemeteries, subject to the site being in close proximity to one (or more) of the district's main settlements, and is readily accessible by car and, ideally, public transport.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Local Planning Authority will impose a planning condition requiring the implementation of a suitable landscaping scheme to further reduce the visual impact of the use.</p>		

CHAPTER	BOX	TITLE
4 - Employment	4.1	
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
137 – CPREssex – the respondent objects to the removal of the reference to sustainable development.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The box in question simply identifies the Council's 7 key objectives taken from our Economic Development Strategy. As such they are not open to challenge as the box simply relates to a statement of fact. The objectives have not been interpreted before putting in this box.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>[BOXED TEXT] BOX 4.1</p> <p>The aim of the Council's Economic Development Strategy is to:</p> <p>work with partners to maximise the economic prospects of businesses in the area, making the district a better place to work.</p> <p>The seven key objectives of the Council's Economic Development Strategy are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work in partnership to support the needs of the business community in the area, to enable it to develop and grow and thus contribute to the economic prosperity of the District. 2. Working with partners, develop the skills of the local workforce to meet the needs of businesses now and in the future, to maintain low levels of unemployment in the District and encourage jobs that add value to the local economy. 3. Support town centre and industrial estate enhancement initiatives aimed at improving the environment ensuring the area is economically prosperous and competitive. 4. Work with partners to ensure that businesses, including rural businesses have access to quality and effective business support initiatives locally. 5. Facilitate appropriate local transport and infrastructure developments which balance businesses needs whilst respecting local environmental constraints. 6. Develop tourism and heritage initiatives which provide new local employment and wealth generation opportunities, and visitor attractions aimed at improving access to recreation facilities and preserving the Districts' heritage for future generations. 7. Taking advantage of inward investment opportunities to secure the future economic prosperity of the District. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
4 – Employment	EB1	Existing sites and the allocation of new sites
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>42 – English Nature – the respondent states that a typographic error has been made in the policy, which should relate to EB2, rather than EB5.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – the respondent states that the policy is too restrictive and thus prevents the adequate development of the district in a changing business environment. They also state that Baltic Wharf has been excluded from the policy and Table 4.2.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
There is no reason to change the policy other than to correct the typographic error.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>Correct the policy as follows:</p> <p>POLICY EB1- EXISTING SITES & THE ALLOCATION OF NEW SITES Within those areas proposed for use or currently used primarily for employment purposes as shown in table 4.2 and on the proposals maps, applications for development within classes B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage) of the Use Classes Order (1987) will be permitted, providing that the criteria in EB2 5 are met.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
4 – Employment	EB2	Criteria for sites
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 42 – English Nature - the respondent offers their support for this policy. 61 - Environment Agency - the respondent offers their support for this policy. 73 – RSPB - the respondent offers their support for this policy. 80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
There are no remaining objections and this policy may now proceed to adoption.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change: POLICY EB2 - CRITERIA FOR SITES In considering applications to use or develop land for employment purposes, regard will be had to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The impact of development on the characteristics of the Metropolitan Green Belt and other designated sites; ii. The ecological value of the site and adjoining land; iii. The availability of land or buildings available for employment; iv. The implications of on and off-site traffic generation; v. The balance of non-industrial uses; vi. Evidence of demand for the particular type of development proposed; vii. The suitability of the area for the proposed use more generally; and viii. Any other benefits offered by the scheme. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
4 – Employment	EB3	Making the best use of available land
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – suggest the following additional text to be added to the end of the policy ...and the protection and enhancement of nature conservation interests.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>121 – BT Plc – the respondent seeks an amendment in line with paragraph 1.15 of PPG6.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>With regard to BT Plc's comments, the LPA has had due regard to paragraph 1.15 of PPG6 in the preparation of this plan and this does not need reiterating in the policy. The comments made by English Nature are an alternative form of words, which have the same intent as the previous improvement suggested by the EWT. There is no reason why this alteration should not be accommodated.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>The following amendment should be incorporated:</p> <p>POLICY EB3 - MAKING THE BEST USE OF AVAILABLE LAND In determining proposals for development for business, industry and warehousing on sites which are not allocated on the proposals maps, the a sequential test contained within PPG6 will be applied.</p> <p>In applying this test the local planning authority will consider how the development will improve its surroundings, the appearance of buildings, screening, any harmful impacts on neighbouring uses, site access, layout <u>and the protection and enhancement of nature conservation interests.</u> and the ecological value of the site and adjoining land.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
4 – Employment	EB6	Design Statements
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
There are no outstanding objections to this policy, which may now proceed unchallenged to adoption.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY EB6 – DESIGN STATEMENTS</p> <p>A design statement must accompany proposals for all major employment development (over 1000m² of floor space and / or a site area 1 hectare). On smaller, but complex or sensitive sites, as defined by the local planning authority, a design statement will also be requested. Such a statement should include an analysis and evaluation of the site and its context, design principles and a design solution. Further guidance on the matters to be included is provided in LPSPG6 and all design statements should address the principles of CS6.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
4 – Employment	EB7	Landscaping
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. However, a typographic error remains.</p> <p>42 – English Nature - the respondent offers their support for this policy.</p> <p>61 - Environment Agency - the respondent offers their support for this policy.</p> <p>111 - Fairview New Homes – the respondent states that they wish to see the phrase ‘improve and enhance’ replaced by ‘maintain and enhance’.</p> <p>121 – BT plc – the respondent states that they wish to see the phrase ‘improve and enhance’ replaced by ‘maintain and enhance’.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The respondents have referred to a phrase that does not occur in the chapter, let alone this policy. There is therefore no reason for a change to be carried out.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY EB7 – LANDSCAPING</p> <p>The local planning authority will require that landscaping proposals form an integral part of any proposal for employment development or design statement. The local planning authority will seek additional landscaping measures including improvements to existing features to reduce the impact of development on established sites and their settings.</p> <p>The Council will have particular regard to the impact of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting, including that for security purposes; • Hard and soft landscaping measures; and • Buffer zones <p>Special attention must be paid to on site earth mounding or planting to protect and enhance the amenities, ecological value and appearance of the surroundings in general, and of neighbouring properties of nature conservation sites in particular. Proposals for the long-term management and maintenance of landscaping proposals must also be included, which will be subject to conditions. Both the design and management of landscaping schemes should identify, protect and enhance nature conservation interests on-site and in surrounding areas.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
4 – Employment	EB8	Baltic Wharf
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent states that there should be a specific reference to the Crouch Estuary SSSI / SPA / Ramsar site and the clarification of the phrase other designated sites.</p> <p>42 – English Nature - the respondent offers their support for this policy, which they state has been strengthened by the additional text.</p> <p>73 – RSPB – The respondent states that there should be a specific reference to the Crouch Estuary SSSI / SPA / Ramsar site.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the phrase other designated sites does not provide clarity.</p> <p>140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – the respondent states that the current policy is too restrictive to allow for the adequate development of the wharf in a changing business environment.</p>		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
The phrase other designated sites is recommended to be removed and replaced as per the respondents’ comments. The comments made by Baltic Wharf and the Essex Chambers of Commerce are not recommended for implementation.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>To amend the policy as follows:</p> <p>POLICY EB8 – BALTIC WHARF</p> <p>Applications for the further development of this site will be considered on their own merits. However, proposals that include expansion, intensification, or significant impacts on the Coastal Protection Zone, Metropolitan Green Belt, Special Landscape Area , <u>Crouch Estuary SSSI, Ramsar Site and Special Protection Area</u> or other designated sites or increases in traffic impact will be refused. Development proposals, which are not in line with PPG2 and not for either storage and wharfage will also be refused.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
4 – Employment	EB9	Essex Marina
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent states that there should be a specific reference to the Crouch Estuary SSSI / SPA / Ramsar site and the clarification of the phrase other designated sites.</p> <p>42 – English Nature - the respondent offers their support for this policy, which they state has been strengthened by the additional text.</p> <p>73 – RSPB – The respondent states that there should be a specific reference to the Crouch Estuary SSSI / SPA / Ramsar site.</p> <p>207 – Essex Marina – the respondent wishes that leisure and tourism uses be added to the list of main uses at the site.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The phrase other designated sites is recommended to be removed and replaced as per the respondents' comments. It is also recommended that leisure and tourism uses be included as main uses of the site.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be amended as follows:</p> <p>POLICY EB9 – ESSEX MARINA Applications for the further development of this site will be considered on their own merits. However, proposals that include expansion, intensification, or significant impacts on the Coastal Protection Zone, Metropolitan Green Belt, Special Landscape Area, <u>Crouch Estuary SSSI, Ramsar Site and Special Protection Area</u> or other designated sites or increases in traffic impact will be refused. Development proposals which are not in line with PPG2 and not related to the main marine uses (defined as being mooring, and maintenance, <u>leisure and tourism</u>) will also be refused.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
4 – Employment	EB10	Stambridge Mills
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>42 – English Nature – the respondent states that the following text (<u>underlined</u>) should be added to the third sentence of the policy High quality design will be required given the prominent waterfront location of this site <u>and the biodiversity interest of the area</u>. Further text is also suggested to be added after paragraph 4.37.</p> <p>61 - Environment Agency – the respondent objects to the inclusion of this site for light industrial uses as it would be contrary to the guidance provided in PPG25. If the Council considers this a sustainable development location, then a flood risk assessment must be submitted and agreed prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>80 - GO-East – the respondent states that 'light industrial' is not a term explicitly used in the Use Classes Order (1987) and the policy should therefore be clarified.</p> <p>136 – Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce - the respondent offers their support for this policy.</p> <p>148 – Ashingdon Parish Council – the respondent objects to this policy as the erection of commercial premises, inclusive of factories on the site should be resisted. This is because the area is already well served by industrial premises. Careful consideration must be given to the coastline, historic features and wildlife in the area.</p> <p>189 – Associated British Foods Plc – the respondent seeks either the reinstatement of the site in policy HP2 or that the use of the site should be deregulated.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The comments made by English Nature and GO-East are all accepted. The comments made by Ashingdon Parish Council and Associated British Foods Plc are not. The comments made by the environment Agency are accepted so far as the need to submit a flood risk assessment is concerned, but the claim that the site and use proposed are incompatible are not. The policy should therefore be amended as shown below, together with an addition after paragraph 4.37.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy and paragraph be changed as follows:</p> <p>POLICY EB10 – STAMBRIDGE MILLS Development at Stambridge Mills will be restricted to class B1 (<u>Business light industrial</u>) uses, as defined by the Use Classes Order 1987. Development proposals must be accompanied by a flood risk assessment and traffic impact assessment. High quality design will be required given the prominent waterfront location of this site <u>and the biodiversity interest of the area</u>. Applications for demolition will not be granted unless accompanied by an acceptable redevelopment scheme.</p> <p>4.37 The Local Planning Authority believes that the site is suitable for B1 (light industrial) uses. Such a development would require the removal of the unsightly buildings on the site and their replacement with well designed units, which would be adequately protected from the risk of flooding. Any development proposals must be accompanied by a flood risk assessment and a traffic impact assessment.</p> <p>4.38 <u>The site is upriver of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site, and is likely to be in direct hydrological connectivity with the habitats of the upper Roach and its riparian land. Therefore any application will need to adequately considered biodiversity interests in and around the site.</u></p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
5 – Transport	TP2	Traffic Management
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The changes made to the policy following the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) have enabled the withdrawal of the representation from GO-East on this policy. However, an objection remains from Rayleigh Civic Society because the policy fails to explicitly mention the problems in Rayleigh. The policy does relate to town centres and the problems of Rayleigh are no worse than those of other parts of the district. It would therefore be wrong to single out Rayleigh for a specific mention.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
POLICY TP2 - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT In development proposals, traffic management measures will be required to:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the environment within historic areas, town centres, other shopping centres, residential areas, villages and rural areas; 2. Improve road safety 3. Improve the capacity of existing roads; 4. Improve conditions for passenger transport, cyclists, pedestrians, the mobility impaired and horse riders; and 5. Manage traffic demand. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
5 – Transport	TP3	Traffic calming
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
This was the only outstanding objection and as this has been removed the policy can proceed to adoption.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
POLICY TP3 - TRAFFIC CALMING New housing, leisure, retail or other employment related development creating significant traffic impacts will not be permitted unless the highway design is appropriate to the locality and incorporates measures to achieve safe traffic speeds and secure a pleasant and safe environment.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
5 – Transport	TP4	Heavy lorry routes
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent states that 'significant' does not provide any certainty regarding traffic impact. 140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – the respondent states that the revised policy does not address the major issue of the retention / development of industry and its needs and requirements of free flowing access for both goods and personnel.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The word 'significant' will be removed from the policy, but no further changes are justified.		
RECOMMENDATION		
Change the policy as follows: POLICY TP4 - HEAVY LORRY ROUTES The Council will refuse applications for development likely to create significant adverse traffic impacts, including heavy vehicle movements that are on sites outside existing or proposed industrial estates or that would give rise to other adverse environmental impacts.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
5 – Transport	TP5	Public transport
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>111 - Fairview New Homes – the respondent states that the policy should include the words ‘where appropriate’ at the end of the second sentence of the policy.</p> <p>121 – BT plc – the respondent states that the policy should include the words ‘where appropriate’ at the end of the second sentence of the policy.</p> <p>140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – the respondent states that protecting sites for development to be near to, or include public transport development participation is discriminatory against cars and goods vehicles.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The introduction of the words ‘where appropriate’ would be superfluous as central government guidance already ensures that contributions should only be sought in certain circumstances. It would also increase uncertainty, when a consistent approach is being sought.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY TP5 - PUBLIC TRANSPORT</p> <p>Development must be well related to existing public transport infrastructure, particularly in rural areas. Where such developments are not well located to such infrastructure, then contributions towards the provision of public transport and alternatives to private car use will be sought. Development that fails to promote sustainable transport choices will be refused.</p> <p>Where former or potential public transport corridors or sites are identified as part of a sustainable transport strategy, the local planning authority will protect these from development that would prejudice their transport role, through the planning process.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
5 – Transport	TP6	Safeguarding & the promotion of walking, cycling & horseriding routes.
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>66 – ECC (Planning) – the respondent states that the policy needs to make reference to supplementary planning guidance.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>209 – ECC (PROW) – the respondent states that it is imperative that routes are legally dedicated to ensure long-term future use and this should be made clear in the policy. It is also important that more effort is given to creating a segregated network of bridleways.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The recommendation made by Essex County Council Public Rights of Way section is accepted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
The additional word will be added.		
<p>POLICY TP6 – SAFEGUARDING & THE PROMOTION OF WALKING, CYCLING & HORSERIDING ROUTES</p> <p>Planning permission will not be granted for development affecting existing cycling, walking and horseriding routes unless the proposals include either the maintenance or diversion of the route, to one which is no less attractive, safe and convenient for public use.</p> <p>Cycling and walking will be promoted as an alternative to using the car especially for shorter distance trips. Development must ensure the:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of a safe and convenient network of <u>dedicated</u> cycle and pedestrian routes linking homes, workplaces, community facilities and transport interchanges and also the provision of secure cycle parking at centres of attraction; 2. Use of traffic management measures to improve conditions for pedestrians, the mobility impaired and cyclists; 3. Provision in new development and transport schemes for pedestrians, the mobility impaired and cyclists; 4. Provision of good access and secure cycle parking facilities at public transport interchanges. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
5 – Transport	TP7	Access for people with impaired mobility
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
This was the only outstanding objection and as this has been removed the policy can proceed to adoption.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
POLICY TP7 - ACCESS FOR PEOPLE WITH IMPAIRED MOBILITY Development to which the public would reasonably expect to have access will only be permitted if provision is made in the design for safe and convenient access by pedestrians and people with impaired mobility.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
5 – Transport	TP8	Public car parks
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the requirement to contribute towards the provision of public car parking is contrary to guidance in paragraph 86 of PPG13. Public car parking should therefore be replaced by a park and ride alternative.</p> <p>111 - Fairview New Homes – the respondent states that the policy should include the words ‘where appropriate’ at the end of the last sentence of the policy.</p> <p>121 – BT plc – the respondent states that the policy should include the words ‘where appropriate’ at the end of the last sentence of the policy.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The introduction of the words ‘where appropriate’ would reduce certainty and allow consistency. The representation made by GO-East is only partially correct. The paragraph in question only states that where the reason for requesting a payment is ...purely around the lack of parking on site. By definition therefore any sites where more than purely the lack of parking is an issue, commuted sums for public car parking remain an option.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY TP8 - PUBLIC CAR PARKS</p> <p>The Council will monitor the use of its public car parks to ascertain whether adequate spaces are available, will ensure that the optimum use is made of them and will take steps to alter provision as necessary.</p> <p>Developments that create significant levels of traffic will be expected to provide sustainable transport options in preference to on-site car parking. Where this is not possible contributions towards the provision or maintenance of public car parking will be required.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
5 – Transport	TP9	Car parking standards
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
78 – ECC (Schools Service) – the respondent states that the two different standards for schools should be removed. It is not ECC policy to provide on-site parking for students. 135 – Rayleigh Town Council – the respondent states that the inclusion of the word minimum is a licence for developers to provide little or no parking space on new developments.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The representation from ECC (Schools Service) is noted and the policy will be amended to include this. The representations made by the other two respondents are duly noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
Change the policy as follows:		
POLICY TP9 - CAR PARKING STANDARDS In considering applications for new development the Council will expect as a general rule the provision of car parking spaces in accordance with the maximum standards set out below and as shown more fully in LPSPG1 and LPSPG2 and contained in individual policies as may be amended from time to time. In addition, adequate space for loading and unloading and turning of vehicles will be required within the application site.		

USE:	STANDARD:	JUSTIFICATION:
A1	Shops – food	1 space per 14m ²
	Non-food	1 space per 20m ²
A2	Financial and Professional Services	1 space per 20m ²
A3	Take away outlets	1 space per 20m ²
	Pubs and Clubs	1 space per 5m ²
	Restaurants	1 space per 5m ²
	Roadside Restaurants	1 space per 5m ²
	Transport Cafes	1 lorry space per 2m ²
B1	Business	1 space per 30m ²
B2	General Industrial	1 space per 50m ² .
B8	Storage or Distribution	1 space per 150m ²
C2	Hotels	1 space per bedroom (guest or staff)
	Residential Care Homes	1 space per resident staff + 1 space per 3 bed spaces/dwelling units
	Hospitals	1 space per 4 staff + 1 space per 3 daily visitors.
C3	Residential Education Establishments	1 space per resident staff + 1 space per 2 other staff.
	Residential:	
	Main urban areas/good access to public transport	1 space per dwelling,
	Urban location with poor off peak public transport services	2 spaces per dwelling,

USE:	STANDARD:	JUSTIFICATION:
	Rural/suburban locations	2 spaces per dwelling for 3 bedroom properties 3 spaces per dwelling for 4 bedroom properties.
D1	Medical Centres	1 space per full-time staff, + 2 spaces per consulting room.
	Day Care Centre	1 space per full-time staff, + 1 space per 4 persons attending.
	Crèches/Nurseries	1 space per full-time staff, + waiting facilities where appropriate.
	Schools (Primary and Secondary Education)	1 space per 2 daytime teaching staff.
	Schools (Primary and Secondary Education)	1 space per 2 daytime teaching staff, + 1 space per 15 students.
	Art Galleries/Museums/Public Halls	1 space per 25m ² .
	Places of Worship/Libraries/ Reading Rooms	1 space per 10m ²
D2	Cinemas	1 space per 5 seats.
	Other Uses (Assembly and Leisure)	1 space per 22m ² .

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
5 – Transport	5.48	London Southend Airport
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
136 – Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce - the respondent offers their support for this paragraph.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>5.48 The solution preferred by the airport operator is to move the Grade 1 listed St Lawrence Church to beyond the Runway End Safety Zone and to extend the runway across Eastwoodbury Lane, thereby allowing the threshold areas to be repositioned. The land for the runway extension and the church, both lie within Southend-on-Sea Borough Council's area.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
5 – Transport	TP10	London Southend Airport
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – the respondent suggests the following extra text be added to the end of the second sentence of the policy ...that demonstrate adequate protection and enhancement of nature conservation and other interests in the area.</p> <p>60 – Highways Agency – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the first part of the policy is a statement of intent and should be relegated to the supporting text. The second part of the policy requiring ...no detriment to the environment... is overly onerous.</p> <p>104 - English Heritage - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The representations made by all, except GO-East are noted. With regard to the representation made by GO-East, the policy is not a statement of intent as they state. The first sentence states what the LPA will require. The latter part of this is not too onerous as any detriment caused would need to be mitigated to ensure that no net loss occurred. It is therefore recommended that this policy is retained unchanged.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY TP10 – LONDON SOUTHEND AIRPORT</p> <p>The Council will support the operation of London Southend Airport as a regional air transport and aircraft maintenance facility and the full realisation of its potential by increases in passenger and freight traffic, subject to no detriment to the environment. The Council will not refuse appropriate development directly related to the aviation facility provided suitable transport assessment and other analysis are carried out. Future expansion and development plans for the airport, will need to include a satisfactory Surface Access Strategy.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
5 – Transport	TP11	Aviation and noise
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY TP11 - AVIATION AND NOISE In dealing with applications for development in areas likely to be affected by noise from London Southend Airport, consideration will be given to imposing conditions requiring adequate sound insulation to buildings and in extreme cases permission may be refused.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT1	Rural issues
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>42 – English Nature - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>61 - Environment Agency - the respondent offers their support for this policy.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the policy reads as a statement of intent. It is suggested that the policy is either relegated to the supporting text or the word 'support' is amended to provide certainty.</p> <p>143 – Sport England - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted and the wording is changed to provide certainty.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>POLICY LT1 - RURAL ISSUES</p> <p>Leisure and tourism proposals in rural areas will be supported permitted provided that the rural landscape, biodiversity and the character of the area will not be adversely affected by reason of the size, scale and design of the proposal, or by the intensity/activity associated with the use.</p>		

CHAPTER	TABLE	TITLE
6 – Leisure & tourism	6.1	Playing field survey sub areas
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
135 – Rayleigh Town Council – the respondent states that the policy refers to wards that no longer exist.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
This was the composition of ward boundaries at the time ' <i>An Assessment of Playing Pitches in the Rochford District</i> ' (October 2002) was written.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change to Table 6.1		

Table 6.1 PLAYING FIELD SURVEY SUB AREAS	
SUB AREA	WARDS COVERED
Rayleigh	Grange & Rawreth, Lodge, Rayleigh, Central, Trinity, Wheatley, Whitehouse
Hockley	Hockley East, Hockley West, Hawkwell West
Hullbridge	Hullbridge Riverside, Hullbridge South
Canewdon	Canewdon
Rochford	Ashingdon, Rochford Eastwood, Rochford Roche, Rochford St Andrews
Great Wakering	Barling & Sutton, Foulness & Great Wakering East, Great Wakering Central, Great Wakering West

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT2	Synthetic sports pitch provision
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change to the policy:		
POLICY LT2 - SYNTHETIC SPORTS PITCH PROVISION The council will promote the provision of at least one full size synthetic sports pitch in the district as well as providing formal open space to assist in meeting the sub area standards in Table 6.3. In assessing the location of any facility the council will take into consideration the local demand for pitch sports and the effect on the amenity of the surrounding area and nature conservation interests.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT3	Public playing pitch provision
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change to the policy:		
<p>POLICY LT3 - PUBLIC PLAYING PITCH PROVISION New proposals for public playing pitches will be required to meet all of the following criteria and have regard for LPSPG10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The finished site should be level, free draining and of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed pitches; ii. It should be located where there is convenient access for the local communities; iii. The proposed pitches are for public use; iv. Vehicular access to the site from the highway can be accommodated without creating a highway hazard; v. It should not have an adverse impact on residential amenity, nature conservation interests or the character of the countryside; vi. The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that provision has been made for the area's long term retention and maintenance. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT7	Private open space
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent states that the policy has been weakened and is poor grammatically. 42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy. 78 – ECC (Schools Service) – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
Duly noted but disagree that policy has been weakened and is poor grammatically.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change to the policy:		
POLICY LT7 – PRIVATE OPEN SPACE Only in exceptional circumstances will the Council consider the suitability of the loss of existing playing pitches, children's play spaces, formal recreation areas, informal open spaces including allotments and amenity areas, whether in public or private ownership. The Council will also explore the potential for equivalent provision elsewhere / off site.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT8	Safeguarding open space
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 42 – English Nature – the respondent continues to offer their support for this policy. 80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 143 – Sport England - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
Duly noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change to the policy: POLICY LT8 – SAFEGUARDING OPEN SPACE Areas of public and private open space in towns and villages that play an important key role in the street scene, have a high townscape value, are of importance to nature conservation or are intrinsic to the character of the area, will be safeguarded. Planning applications for the development of such sites that would be detrimental to these features will be refused.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT9	New Indoor sports & leisure facilities
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY LT9 – INDOOR SPORTS & LEISURE FACILITIES</p> <p>Proposals for sports and recreation facilities will be permitted provided that the proposal meets the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provides sufficient benefit to outweigh the loss of the existing land use; ii. Will allow satisfactory access to the site, provide adequate off-street parking and the adjoining roads are capable of taking any increase in traffic; iii. Should have nearby links to public transport; iv. Will have no adverse impact regarding noise disturbance on the locality; v. Will have no adverse impact on the visual amenities of the area; vi. Will have regard to the existence of similar facilities with the locality; and vii. Conforms to other policies of the Plan including the irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a), Metropolitan Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest or other sites of nature conservation interest, Special Landscape Areas and the Coastal Protection Belt. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT11	New play space provision
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
Duly noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY LT11 – NEW PLAY SPACE PROVISION New play space provision in the district, whether provided in association with development or by other means, should meet all of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) It will be easily accessible by local residents, secure and easily visible; b) It will be equipped according to the standards of the District Council; c) It will not have an adverse impact on residential amenity, nature conservation interests or character of the countryside; d) The play space is for public use in perpetuity; e) Pedestrian access exists or will be provided via a footpath giving safe access to the site. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	Statement of Intent	Golf courses
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent states that a statement of intent is confusing and an approach not noted in any other local plan they are familiar with.		
81 - Southend-on-Sea BC - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree that a statement of intent is confusing and will reinstate policy.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the statement of intent be deleted and the policy reinstated:		
<p>POLICY LT15 - GOLF COURSES & EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING FACILITIES</p> <p>Applications for golf course and driving range facilities will be required to satisfy the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the proposal will not adversely affect Sites of Scientific Interest, Ancient Landscapes or Ancient Woodlands as shown on the Proposals Map; ii. the proposal will not adversely affect natural features and habitats of nature conservation importance and will include measures which allow for local habitat creation; iii. the proposal will be in harmony with the landscape and will avoid prominent locations, the dominant features of the existing site will be retained and incorporated into the scheme; iv. where built development is proposed, preference will be for the use of existing buildings and will be restricted to those facilities that are essentially required to serve the use of land for golf. New buildings not essentially related, including for residential, social and holiday accommodation, will not be permitted; v. the layout of the course, the siting and size of its buildings, car parking and a landscape scheme should be submitted as part of the planning application and not left for later approval; vi. the proposal will satisfactorily incorporate existing public rights of way; and vii. that safe and convenient access can be made to the principal road network and that the traffic generated would not be detrimental to the rural roads and the small settlements that might be affected from the passing of vehicles. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT14	Horse riding facilities
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that criterion vi is negatively worded and requires a more positive re-wording.</p> <p>180 – Hockley Parish Council – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>209 – ECC (PROW) – the respondent states the word 'bridlepath' is not a legally defined term under the Highways Act (1980). The word 'bridleway' should be used instead.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted and agree that criterion vi is negatively worded and that 'bridlepath' be changed to 'bridleway'.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That paragraph 6.40 be amended:</p> <p>Proposals utilising existing redundant farm/agricultural buildings within the countryside are most likely to be favoured. New equestrian development must be closely located and related to existing development and should not be in remote/isolated rural locations. Policy TP6 deals with the safeguarding and provision of new <u>bridleways</u> paths.</p> <p>That the policy be amended to:</p> <p>POLICY LT146 - HORSE RIDING FACILITIES Proposals for horse related development will be granted planning permission provided that the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Proposals for equestrian establishments whether for private use or as a commercial livery will need to demonstrate that there is adequate land within the curtilage of the site to allow for the proper care of horses, including stabling, grazing and exercise, in accordance with the British Horse Society Standards; ii. Proposals for buildings to serve private use or commercial livery in locations outside of the urban settlement areas must be the result of re-use of existing former farm/agricultural buildings; OR be located close to and relate to existing development that is controlled and under the ownership of the applicant, (for example a range of existing farm buildings or an area of paddock land immediately adjacent to the applicant's dwelling house); iii. the proposal is well related to existing or proposed bridleways and will not cause conflicts between equestrians, and have no adverse effect on the road or highway safety of the area; iv. the proposal will not be visually intrusive or detrimental the character of the area or nature conservation interests; 		

- v. there will not be a detrimental affect on the amenity of the local area by virtue of noise, smell or disturbance;
- vi. new dwellings associated with equestrian facilities will ~~not~~ only be permitted, ~~except~~ within existing or proposed residential areas, as defined on the proposals maps; and
- vii. any proposal for stables or equestrian development in remote, isolated locations unrelated to existing development that may affect the character or compartmentalize the countryside will be refused.

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT15	Water recreation facilities
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent states that the changes made have strengthened the policy and they continue to offer their support.		
42 – English Nature – the respondent continues to offer their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY LT15 – WATER RECREATION FACILITIES</p> <p>Proposals for new facilities or expansion of existing facilities will not be permitted within the Coastal Protection Belt. Within the already developed areas of the coast proposals for water recreation facilities will be considered against the following criteria and the contents of PPG25 (Development and Flood Risk):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Evidence is provided that there will be no adverse affects on the Essex Estuaries European Marine site, to wildlife or their habitats or on other sites of nature conservation importance; ii. The proposal is of a scale, design and nature that safeguards the amenities and character of the surrounding locality; iii. There is sufficient capacity on the water to accommodate for the proposal, having regard to the existing use of the river and the proposed level of use in that area; iv. The proposal does not lead to problems of safety for other river users; v. The proposal will not create detrimental traffic generation affects and that access, parking, facilities for non-car users and existing rights of way are satisfactorily provided for. 		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
6 – Leisure & tourism	6.44	Water recreation
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>6.44 In order to keep the volume of water recreation on the Rivers Crouch and Roach to a minimum the Council will look inland for additional facilities. Sport England identifies the main opportunity for further areas of water for recreational purposes in Essex, to be through the restoration of mineral workings to 'wet pits'. These wet pits can have potential for specialised sports such as wind surfing, sub aqua, rowing and canoe racing, as well as fishing and nature conservation interests. At the current time there are no appropriate wet pits within the district.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT16	Dry pits
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent states that the changes made have strengthened the policy and they continue to offer their support.		
42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY LT16 – DRY PITS</p> <p>Proposals for the after-use of mineral workings for quiet recreational purposes will be permitted if all of the following criteria are satisfied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The site is not in or adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest or other designated nature conservation site; b) No built structures, other than those directly related to providing for those using the facility i.e. toilets, changing rooms etc. will be permitted; c) An ecological survey is carried out; d) Satisfactory access and parking provision must be achieved for the proposed use; e) Opportunities will be sought to create or enhance habitats for species listed in the Essex Biodiversity Action Plan. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT17	Tourism
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
Duly noted		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY LT17 – TOURISM</p> <p>The council will encourage the provision of tourist attractions for visitors to the district through the granting of planning permission where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Access is available by a choice of means of transport; ii. The vehicular access to and from the highway is safe; iii. The character and appearance of the existing street scene, the existing historic fabric of the development, and/or the existing landscape/countryside character of the area or nature conservation interests will not be adversely affected; and iv. There will be no significant impact on local amenities. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT18	Rural tourism
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – the respondent would like to see the phrase A bat replaced by An ecological in the policy and additional text added to paragraph 6.52. It suggests this insertion after the fifth sentence However, given many of these buildings can be used as roosts for bats and other wildlife, an ecological survey must be undertaken to ensure their protection.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the 6 bedroom demarcation is not justified as that the requirement for a bat survey in all cases is overly onerous.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted and agree 'bat' be replaced with 'ecological' – suggested extra wording to paragraph 6.52 is superfluous as it is covered in 1. (iv) of the policy. It is not agreed that the 6 bedroom demarcation is unjustified.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>Policy be amended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The change of use and/or conversion of existing buildings in the countryside to accommodate leisure or tourism related facilities (including hotels and guesthouses with less than 6 bedrooms) will be permitted, provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal re-uses a building constructed of permanent materials with a reasonable expectation of life; The proposal maintains or enhances the rural environment and the landscape character of the area; Provision can be made for the parking of guests' vehicles within a farm complex, or on a plot, without causing visual harm and safe access to the site can be obtained without any detrimental visual changes to the junction with the highway; and An <u>ecological</u> bat survey is undertaken; Planning permission for the re-use of rural buildings for tourist accommodation may include, amongst others, a condition restricting the construction of additional buildings on a farm holding or plot. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT19	New hotel & guesthouse accommodation
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent seeks a re-wording of parts A and B to include reference to nature conservation interests.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that it is too onerous for all new hotels and guesthouses to have car parking arrangements where there is good access to public transport. The words car parking should therefore be deleted.</p> <p>104 - English Heritage - the respondent states that part B(iv) should be amended to end ...and on the historic environment.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>Agree to changes in wording as per representations made by EWT and English Heritage. The consideration of suitable car parking must be compatible with location, but nonetheless is an important consideration and therefore deserves to be retained.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>The policy be amended:</p> <p>POLICY LT19 – NEW HOTEL & GUESTHOUSE ACCOMMODATION</p> <p>A. Proposals for hotel or guesthouse accommodation (with six or more bedrooms), within residential areas, as defined on the proposal maps, will only be permitted if all of the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Suitable means of access, car parking and servicing arrangements will be provided; ii. The location is well related to the road hierarchy and public transport is available nearby; and iii. The proposal has no adverse affect on the amenity of residential areas, Conservation Areas, listed buildings, or the character of the landscape <u>or nature conservation interests</u>. <p>B. Proposals for hotel or guesthouse accommodation (with six or more bedrooms) outside residential areas, as defined on the proposal maps, will be permitted if all of the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A need for the development has been demonstrated; ii. Demonstration that there is no site available within existing residential areas; iii. The site should be located close to the edge of existing residential areas; iv. The scale and appearance of the development will not have an adverse impact on the <u>historic environment</u>, character of the landscape <u>or nature conservation interests</u>; v. There will be no adverse impact on designated wildlife sites or on the Metropolitan Green Belt; vi. The site is accessible by a choice of types of transport. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT20	Touring caravans and tents
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
42 – English Nature – the respondent offers their support for this policy. 80 - GO-East - the respondent states that this is a statement of intent and should be relegated to the supporting text.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
The support duly noted. It is not agreed that policy should be deleted. It is important to maintain control over inappropriate development within the Green Belt and assist the rural economy/tourist facilities within the district.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
POLICY LT20 – TOURING CARAVANS & TENTS Facilities for touring and transit caravans and tents will be limited to within the current extent of development that exists on the sites shown on the proposals map. <u>Environmental improvements within existing sites will be encouraged.</u>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT21	Sports causing noise or disturbance
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – The respondent continues to support this policy.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – the respondent continues to offer their support for this policy.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the policy is negatively worded and requires re-wording in a more positive way.</p> <p>140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – the respondent states that as the Rochford district is to be the leisure and tourism centre of the Thames Gateway South Essex, this policy is too negative.</p> <p>143 – Sport England - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted and agree to change policy to be more positive.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be amended:</p> <p>POLICY LT21 – SPORTS CAUSING NOISE OR DISTURBANCE</p> <p>Proposals for sport or leisure facilities and activities likely to cause noise or disturbance <u>must satisfy the LPA that</u> will be refused unless it is proven there will be no adverse effects on:</p> <p>a) occupiers of nearby residential properties/plots; b) existing flora and fauna (for example overwintering birds); or c) traffic impact or highway safety</p> <p>by virtue of the scale, siting, design, construction or operation of the activity.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – Leisure & Tourism	LT22	Floodlighting
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent continues to support this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Duly noted		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY LT22 – FLOODLIGHTING Applications for development involving external lighting will only be acceptable if the following can be demonstrated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The lighting is designed to be as directional as possible using the minimum number of lights required with the aim of reducing light pollution; ii. A curfew time of 10.00 p.m.; and iii. Consideration is given to the effect of light upon local residents, vehicle users, pedestrians, local wildlife and the night sky. 		

CHAPTER	PLANNING OBJECTIVE	TITLE
7 – Building conservation & archaeology	B1	
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
104 - English Heritage - the respondent states that the words 'their settings' should be the final words in the objective.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Amend the objective in line with English Heritage's comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
Change as follows:		
B1	To protect and enhance the historic character of settlements, particularly within the conservation areas and to ensure the retention of all listed buildings, their settings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments <u>and their settings</u>.	

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
7 – Building conservation & archaeology	BC1	Conservation Areas: general
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
180 – Hockley Parish Council – the respondent object to the failure to include a rural conservation designation for the buildings around Hockley parish church.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Central government guidance advises that the number of non-statutory designations should be reduced in local plans. There is therefore no justification for a one-off designation covering a small area.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY BC1 - CONSERVATION AREAS: GENERAL</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, including the buildings, open spaces, trees, views and other aspects of the environment that contribute to the character of such areas.</p> <p>Applications for new buildings, extensions and alterations within, or affecting Conservation Areas, will be permitted provided that the following design criteria are met:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The design and siting of the proposal respects the townscape character, and the proposal logically forms a part of the larger composition of the area in which it is situated; ii. The mass of the proposal is in scale and harmony with adjoining buildings and the area as a whole, and the volumes making up its block form are proportioned such that they form a satisfactory composition with each other and with adjoining buildings; iii. The proposal uses appropriate architectural detailing to reinforce the character of the conservation area within which it is sited. Architectural details in the new building would be expected to complement the existing development; iv. The external materials are appropriate to the particular building and to the character of the area; and, v. in the case of shopfronts, the proposal exhibits a high standard of shopfront design, reflecting the traditional character of the particular conservation area. <p>Guidance to be used for the assessment of proposals against the above criteria is to be found in LPSPG7.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
7 – Building conservation & archaeology	BC2	Demolition within Conservation Areas
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
104 - English Heritage - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 133 – House Builders Federation – the respondent states that the addition to the end of the policy is too onerous and could make it more difficult to bring forward brownfield site developments.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The final part of the policy is required because of the significant delays that have occurred in Rochford for the redevelopment of sites following the granting of consent to the detriment of the historic environment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY BC2 - DEMOLITION WITHIN CONSERVATION AREAS</p> <p>Consent for the demolition of a building in a conservation area will only be granted in cases where all of the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. (a) the building to be demolished is of no architectural or historical interest and makes no positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area; or, (b) sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the building is beyond reasonable repair, having regard to its structural condition, the cost of repairing and maintaining it in relation to its importance, and to the value derived from its continued use; and that every effort has been made to find compatible alternative uses for the building and to sell it on the open market at a price reflecting its structural condition. ii. detailed plans for the after-use of the site have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. (In cases where the after-use of the site includes development requiring planning permission, such permission must have been applied for and granted in order that the terms of this criterion be met); and <p>The local planning authority will require the signing of a legal agreement before permission for demolition is granted, requiring the redevelopment of the site within an agreed timeframe.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
7 – Building conservation & archaeology	BC4	Demolition of Listed Buildings
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
104 - English Heritage - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period, although they would like to see the removal of the requirement to make such storage to the satisfaction of English Heritage in all cases.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
English Heritage are the experts in this field and therefore it is not unreasonable to ensure that storage is carried out to their satisfaction.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY BC4 - DEMOLITION OF LISTED BUILDINGS</p> <p>Consent for the demolition of a listed building will only be granted in wholly exceptional cases, where all of the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the building is structurally unsound and cannot reasonably be made safe; and / or ii. all reasonable efforts have been made:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to maintain the existing use of the building; b) to find compatible alternative uses for the building; c) to sell the building on the open market at a realistic price reflecting the building's condition; and, d) to seek preservation of the building through charitable or community ownership, but that all of these efforts have failed; and, iii. that demolition and subsequent redevelopment of the site would produce substantial benefits for the community which would decisively outweigh the loss arising from demolition; and, iv. in the case of a listed building situated within a conservation area, detailed plans for the after-use of the site have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. (In cases where the after-use of the site includes development requiring planning permission, such permission must have been applied for and granted in order that the terms of this criterion be met). <p>Where permission for demolition is granted then provision for the recording and / or storage of features and materials will be required to the satisfaction of English Heritage.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
7 – Building conservation & archaeology	7.14	Archaeology
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
104 - English Heritage - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>7.1 Archaeological remains are a finite and non-renewable resource. In many cases they are highly fragile and vulnerable to damage or destruction. These sites contain information about our past, are part of our sense of place and are valuable for their own sake and for their role in education, leisure and tourism. As a result it is important to ensure that archaeological remains are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
7 – Building conservation & archaeology	BC5	Development affecting archaeological sites
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the word 'potential' is misleading and should be explained to provide certainty. 104 - English Heritage - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The recommendation for the addition of the word 'potential' was by English Heritage, who are the government advisors on the historic environment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
POLICY BC5 - DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES Applications for development that would affect sites of known or potential archaeological importance must be accompanied by sufficient information (this will consist of an archaeological field evaluation, unless advised otherwise by the local planning authority) to allow the local planning authority to assess the importance of the site, the likely impact of the development proposal and, on the basis of these findings, to determine the appropriate course of action.		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
7 – Building conservation and archaeology	7.19	Relevant LPSPG
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
137 – CPREssex – the respondent states that the list needs to be extended to include other relevant SPGs.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
There would appear to be further Local Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes (LPSPGs) which have been adopted by the Council over time, which are relevant and worthy of inclusion in the list.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the list be extended as follows:</p> <p>Relevant Local Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance</p> <p><u>LPSPG1 – Housing Design</u></p> <p>LPSPG5 - Design Statements</p> <p>LPSPG7 - Design Guidance for Conservation Areas</p> <p>LPSPG8 - Shop Fronts - Security and Design</p> <p>LPSPG9 - Conservation Area Maps</p> <p><u>Essex Design Guide</u></p> <p><u>Rochford Historic Town Project Assessment</u></p> <p><u>Rayleigh Historic Town Project Assessment</u></p>		

CHAPTER	PLANNING OBJECTIVE	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	N4	
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – The respondent supports this policy in principle, but it should also include a reference to species.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
That the objective should be changed in accordance with the representation.		
RECOMMENDATION		
Change as follows:		
N4	To protect, conserve and enhance <u>species</u>, areas and features of nature conservation importance.	

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
8 – Natural resources	8.7	Landscape, trees & agricultural land
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – the respondent supports the re-wording of the last sentence of this paragraph. 61 - Environment Agency - the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>8.7 The Local Planning Authority will seek throughout the landscape high standards of development, including the location, siting, design and materials used, as well as ensuring that the proposal will contribute to the enhancement or, where appropriate, improvement of the character of the area in which it is proposed. Tree planting and landscaping schemes using native species appropriate to their location will be an important part of new development.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR1	Special Landscape Areas
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 205 – M Giles – the respondent wishes that his land adjacent to Bull Lane in Rayleigh be added to the overall housing allocation and removed from the Special Landscape Area.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
No change necessary as the land in question is an integral part of the Special Landscape Area.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>POLICY NR1 - SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS</p> <p>Within the three Special Landscape Areas identified on the proposals map development will not be allowed unless its location, size, siting, design, materials and landscaping accord with the character of the area in which the development is proposed.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR2	Historic landscape
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – the respondent supports the tenet of the policy, but suggests an alternative wording for the second part of the policy.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – the respondent continues to offer their support for this policy.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the word 'significant' does not provide certainty and should be clarified.</p> <p>205 – M Giles – the respondent wishes that his land adjacent to Bull Lane in Rayleigh be added to the overall housing allocation and removed from the Historic Landscape Area.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment other than to agree to the removal of the word 'significant'.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>POLICY NR2 - HISTORIC LANDSCAPE</p> <p>Within the areas of historic landscape development which would adversely affect the historic importance, existing landscape character or physical appearance of Ancient Woodlands or Ancient Landscapes as defined on the proposals map will not be permitted.</p> <p>Development which borders areas identified as Ancient Landscapes or Ancient Woodlands will be required to incorporate significant native natural buffering to mitigate against any potential damage both during construction and from subsequent use.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR3	Tree protection
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – the respondent continues to support this policy.		
42 – English Nature - the respondent offers their support for this policy, but would like to see a reference in the supporting text to the wildlife value of trees in urban areas.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
That additional text be added to paragraph 8.11 to satisfy the objection.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That paragraph 8.11 be amended as follows:		
<p>Tree Protection</p> <p>8.11 Trees are fundamental to the landscape, particularly in urban areas. They provide valuable visual and nature interest to the streetscape <u>and often have a high wildlife value</u>. The Council will serve Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) on woodlands, groups and individual trees where they are considered to be at risk and where their removal would be considered to have an adverse effect on the local environment. Many trees in Conservation Areas are protected and intention to fell must be notified to the LPA.</p> <p>That policy NR3 remain unchanged:</p> <p>POLICY NR3 - TREE PROTECTION</p> <p>Development that adversely affects the amenity value or viability of individual trees, groups of trees or woodlands that are considered ancient or that form an important part of the landscape or townscape, will be refused.</p> <p>Applicants will provide an arboricultural method statement in all cases where a development proposal could affect a preserved tree(s). Proposals for development that would adversely affect the amenity value or viability of preserved trees will be refused.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
8 – Natural resources	8.20	Biodiversity
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 - Environment Agency – the respondent requests the replacement of the word 'seek' in the first sentence with the word 'require'. Also the respondent would like to see the policy extended to all sites.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
It is not thought to be reasonable to require this information to be supplied for all sites.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>Change as follows:</p> <p>8.20 Council will <u>require</u> seek adequate ecological information to be provided by developers when submitting proposals for development on brownfield sites, or other sites thought to be of significance for nature conservation, where these are not already covered by an Environmental Impact Assessment. In the absence of adequate information forthcoming the Council will be expected to refuse such proposals.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
8 – Natural resources	8.21	Biodiversity
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>61 - Environment Agency – the respondent requests the replacement of the bulletpoints with the following text:</p> <p>“Previously developed land can support a complex range of ecological niches that are often absent from surrounding intensively managed urban or arable land such as the presence of patches of bare ground, the presence of significant amounts of dead wood or disused buildings which can attract a range of specialist plants and animals.”</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The suggested text is acceptable and is recommended for insertion.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the text be changed as follows:</p> <p>8.21 As well as greenfield land, previously developed land can support considerable biodiversity interest because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it offers opportunities for wildlife to colonise; • much of the farmed countryside is in poor ecological condition; and • quasi-natural niches are rare in the wider environment (e.g. bare ground, lack of pesticides/herbicides/fertilisers) <p><u>Previously developed land can support a complex range of ecological niches that are often absent from surrounding intensively managed urban or arable land such as the presence of patches of bare ground, the presence of significant amounts of dead wood or disused buildings which can attract a range of specialist plants and animals.</u></p> <p>Where development on previously developed land with nature conservation interest is permitted, the creation of compensatory habitat(s) will be expected under the provisions of the nature conservation policy suite.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR4	Biodiversity on development sites
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – the respondent continues to offer its support for this policy. 42 – English Nature - the respondent continues to offer their support for this policy. 61 - Environment Agency - the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY NR4 - BIODIVERSITY ON DEVELOPMENT SITES</p> <p>Applicants will be required to incorporate appropriate measures in development proposals to facilitate and encourage biodiversity. Measures will include the provision of features for the benefit of nature and landscape conservation, such as grassland, woodland, ponds and other aquatic features.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
8 – Natural resources	8.25	Ramsar sites
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>61 - Environment Agency – the respondent requests the following text to replace the fourth sentence:</p> <p>Ramsar sites are notified based on a range of assessment criteria. The criteria for waterbirds state that a wetland should be considered internationally important if it regularly supports 20,000 or more waterbirds and/or if it regularly supports 1% of the individuals in a population of one species of waterbird.</p> <p>They also wish to correct a typographic error in the third sentence.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Correct the text as suggested by the Environment Agency.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>Change as follows:</p> <p><u>RAMSAR SITES</u></p> <p>8.25 Ramsar sites are named after an international conference held on wetland and wildfowl conservation at Ramsar in Iran, in 1971. The Convention on Conservation Wetlands of International Importance was ratified by the UK Government in 1976. The UK accepted responsibility to promote the conservation of wetlands of international significance within its territory with respect to birds, plants and animals they support. They also qualify because they regularly support over 20,000 waterfowl as well as internationally important popular populations of several species of waterfowl (over 1% of individuals in a population). Ramsar sites are notified based on a range of assessment criteria. The criteria for waterbirds state that a wetland should be considered internationally important if it regularly supports 20,000 or more waterbirds and/or if it regularly supports 1% of the individuals in a population of one species of waterbird. There are two listed Ramsar sites in Rochford District: Foulness and the Crouch and Roach Estuaries.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
8 – Natural resources	8.27	Special Protection Areas
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 - Environment Agency – the respondent requests the removal of the second sentence from the second bulletpoint as it is not relevant to the plan.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Correct the text as suggested by the Environment Agency.		
RECOMMENDATION		
Change as follows:		
<p>8.27 Rochford has two sites that have been confirmed as SPAs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Crouch and Roach Estuaries SPA qualifies under Article 4.2 of the EU Birds Directive by supporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internationally important assemblage of waterfowl (wildfowl and waders) • Internationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species. 2. Foulness SPA qualifies under Article 4.1 of the EU Birds Directive by supporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • internationally important breeding populations of regularly occurring Annex 1 species: sandwich tern (<i>Sterna sandvicensis</i>), common tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>), little tern (<i>Sterna albifrons</i>) and avocet (<i>Recurvirostra avosetta</i>); and • internationally important wintering population of the Annex 1 species hen harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>). The habitat for this species to feed does not occur within the Essex Estuaries European Marine Sites. 		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
8 – Natural resources	8.28	Special Areas of Conservation
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent states that there is typographic error as the paragraph refers to policy NR6, which has been deleted.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agreed the bracketed text should be removed.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the paragraph be changed as follows:		
<p>8.28 SAC's are intended to protect natural habitat of European importance and the habitats of threatened species of wildlife under Article 3 of the Habitats Directive (EC Council Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora, 1992). Member states are required to designate suitable areas as Special Areas of Conservation and to protect these areas from damaging development (see policy NR6).</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR5	Local nature Reserves and Wildlife Sites
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – the respondent continues to offer its support for this policy.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – the respondent suggests additional text to be added to the justification for policy NR5:</p> <p>“In cases where justification for a development proposal clearly outweighs the need to safeguard the nature conservation value of the site, compensation may be provided for within or close to the development site, but when this is not possible, elsewhere in the plan area. Development will not be permitted where such agreements cannot be secured, through legal agreements, or planning conditions.”</p> <p>73 – RSPB - the respondent offers their support for this policy.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the phrase ‘are likely to’ does not provide any certainty. The policy should be re-worded or revert to its original wording.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The comments are duly noted and the additional text will be added to increase certainty.		
RECOMMENDATION		
Change the policy as follows:		
<p>POLICY NR5 – LOCAL NATURE RESERVES AND WILDLIFE SITES</p> <p>Proposals for development which <u>will</u> are likely to adversely affect areas identified as Local Nature Reserves, Wildlife Sites or Regionally Important Geological Sites, will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the justification for the proposal clearly outweighs the need to safeguard the nature conservation value of the site and appropriate compensatory measures can be provided, which ensure that there is no net loss of the asset which has been affected.</p> <p><u>In cases where justification for a development proposal clearly outweighs the need to safeguard the nature conservation value of the site, compensation may be provided for within or close to the development site, but when this is not possible, elsewhere in the plan area. Development will not be permitted where such agreements cannot be secured, through legal agreements, or planning conditions.</u></p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR6	Other landscape features of importance for nature conservation
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – the respondent continues to offer its support for this policy.</p> <p>61 - Environment Agency - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the word 'may' does not provide certainty and should be replaced by the word 'would'.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The representation made by GO-East is accepted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>The policy is changed as follows:</p> <p>POLICY NR6 - OTHER LANDSCAPE FEATURES OF IMPORTANCE FOR NATURE CONSERVATION</p> <p>When considering proposals for development the Local Planning Authority will endeavour to protect the following landscape features, which are of importance for wild fauna and flora from loss or damage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hedgerows • Linear tree belts • Plantations and woodlands • Semi-natural grasslands • Marshes • Watercourses • Reservoirs • Lakes • Ponds • Networks or patterns of other locally important habitats <p>Development which <u>would</u> may adversely affect, directly or indirectly, the landscape features listed above will only be permitted if it can be proven that the reasons for the development outweigh the need to retain the feature and that mitigating measures can be provided for, which would reinstate the nature conservation value of the features. Appropriate management of these features will be encouraged through the imposition of conditions on planning permissions where appropriate and/or endeavour to achieve the completion of a legal agreement to secure the provision of a replacement feature of equivalent value, and to ensure the future management thereof.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR7	Species protection
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – the respondent continues to object to this policy and believes that planning permission should be granted only in exceptional circumstances on sites that contain protected species.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
It is thought that the adoption of the same text as used in policy NR5, will lead to the removal of this objection.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be changed as follows:		
<p>POLICY NR7 – SPECIES PROTECTION</p> <p>Planning permission will not be granted for development likely to cause harm to species protected under English and/or European Law. <u>Development will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the justification for the proposal clearly outweighs the need to safeguard the nature conservation value of the species or its habitat. In such cases</u> Where development is permitted that is likely to have an adverse affect upon the habitat of protected species, the local planning authority will impose conditions and/or seek the completion of a legal agreement in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. secure the protection of individual members of the species; ii. minimise the disturbance to the species; and iii. provide adequate alternative habitats to sustain at least the current levels of population. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR8	Coastal Protection Belt
RESPONDENT’S COMMENTS		
42 – English Nature – the respondent suggests that the following additional text be added to the end of the policy ...or geological features. They also suggest additional text be added in support of this policy to the end of paragraph 8.47. This would state Rochford District Council will seek to prevent new development in inappropriate coastal locations where features of nature conservation importance, namely wildlife and geological features may be adversely affected.		
OFFICER’S COMMENTS		
The need for an insertion of a reference to geological features is accepted. However, the second part of the representation would seem to replicate what the policy is already saying.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be changed as follows:		
<p>POLICY NR8 – COASTAL PROTECTION BELT</p> <p>Within the Coastal Protection Belt priority will be given to the protection of the rural and undeveloped coastline. Applications for development will not be granted planning permission unless it can be shown that the development would not adversely affect the open and rural character of the coastline, or its historic features, or wildlife <u>or geological features</u>.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
8 – Natural resources	8.52	Flood risk
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
135 – Rayleigh Town Council – the respondent points out a typographic error, where the word flood occurs twice in succession.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
That the extra word 'flood' be removed.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the paragraph be amended as follows:		
<p>8.52 A series of floodplain maps are produced by the Environment Agency. The LPA has produced maps, taking advice from the Environment Agency, showing the flood risk areas considered to be developed, sparsely developed and undeveloped, and functional floodplain, to which the policy below applies. The floodplain maps are indicative only and do not distinguish between the defended and undefended flood flood risk areas. It should be noted that where flood risk areas are proven to be defended, these are areas where flood defences reduce, not remove, the risk of flooding.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR9	Development within flood risk areas
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY NR9 - DEVELOPMENT WITHIN FLOOD RISK AREAS</p> <p>Applications for development within flood risk areas will be accompanied by full flood risk assessments to enable the Local Planning Authority to properly consider the level of risk posed to the proposed development throughout its lifetime, and the effectiveness of flood mitigation and management measures.</p> <p>Within developed areas of a flood risk area development may be permitted, subject to the conclusions of the flood risk assessment and the suitability of the flood mitigation and management measures recommended therein.</p> <p>Within sparsely developed and undeveloped areas of a flood risk area, commercial, industrial and new residential development will not be permitted except in exceptional cases. Other applications (including applications for the replacement of existing dwellings on a one-for-one basis) will be considered on their merits, having regard to the conclusions of the flood risk assessment and the suitability of the flood mitigation and management measures recommended therein.</p> <p>Within the functional floodplain buildings will not be permitted except in wholly exceptional cases. Other applications will be considered on their merits, having regard to the conclusions of the flood risk assessment and the suitability of the flood mitigation and management measures recommended therein.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
8 – Natural resources	8.55	Flood risk
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 – Environment Agency – the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>8.25 The 1988 Local Plan saw the introduction of a policy permitting in principle further permanent residential properties in the riverside settlement of Kingsmans Farm Road, which was also continued in the 1995 First Review Local Plan. However, since then the Environment Agency has identified inadequacies in the defences protecting the existing properties. This led to a planning application in 2001 for tidal defence improvement works in order to meet the minimum standard required for this particular area. The settlement is defined in line with Table 1 of PPG25, as being High risk / Sparsely developed. The proposed defences will not be to the necessary standard as to allow for further residential development, as advocated in the recently published PPG25.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
8 – Natural resources	8.56	Sustainable drainage systems
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 – Environment Agency – the respondent continues to offer their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS</p> <p>8.56 Surface water run off from new development can also lead to an increased risk of flooding. Where it is understood that any proposal will increase the flood risk the LPA will require the developer to provide a flood risk assessment to consider the level of risk posed and the intended mitigation and management measures. The LPA will also seek to ensure that development does not adversely affect the water catchments of existing watercourses.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR10	Sustainable drainage systems
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – the respondent continues to support the objectives of the policy and suggest wording to strengthen it and to make it more consistent with paragraph NR10.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY NR10 - SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS In cases where there is a perceived risk of flooding from surface water run-off arising from the development, the local planning authority will require the submission of a flood risk assessment in order to properly consider the proposal. The assessment must include details of sustainable drainage systems to be incorporated in the development to ensure that any risk of flooding is not increased by surface water runoff arising therefrom.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
8 – Natural resources	8.61 <i>et seq</i>	Creation of intertidal habitats
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 – Environment Agency – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
8.61	The LPA will support the (re-)creation of coastal habitats provided that there will be a clear public benefit such as making a contribution to the achievement of Government biodiversity targets. One way to re-create coastal habitats is by allowing sections of the sea wall, which have been identified as having no economic justification for continued maintenance, to be breached by the sea through a process often referred to as managed realignment.	
8.62	The Environment Agency, who have a regulatory and supervisory duty for flood defence matters recognise that there are sea walls where managed realignment schemes could be a possibility as shown in their report Essex Sea Wall Management (1998).	
8.63	The Environment Agency is developing an Estuary Flood Management Strategy for the Rivers Roach and Crouch. This Flood Management Strategy Plan will identify the most socio-economic, hydrodynamic and environmentally sustainable means of providing flood management measures throughout the estuary as a whole, whilst also ensuring that the legal obligations to protect and enhance protected environmental sites and habitats are met.	
8.64	This will involve changes to some flood defence strategies including the incorporation of managed realignment in order to reduce pressures on higher priority defences elsewhere in the estuary. Any proposals to modify flood defences, including maintenance, should be considered in the light of the Estuary Flood Management Strategy. It should be noted that any such proposals are likely to require planning consent and detailed consideration in accordance with the Habitats Directive.	
8.65	The managed realignment of sea defences would lead to the loss of other land types, which could include agricultural land or other habitats. The Council will take into consideration the retention of the best and most versatile agricultural land in accordance with Policy NR4 and also the nature conservation value of the land in accordance with Policies NR6 to NR10 (inclusive).	

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
8 – Natural Resources	NR11	Creation of intertidal habitats
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>73 – RSPB - the respondent offers their support for this policy.</p> <p>209 – ECC (PROW) – the respondent states that as much of the coastline is a public right of way, the PROW team at ECC need to be informed at an early stage to ensure that provision is made to ensure a safeguarded route. Also the opportunity to create additional links to the remainder of the PROW network needs to be explored.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That paragraph 8.67 be amended as follows:</p> <p>8.67 Significant changes to the coastline are not to be taken lightly and the involvement of English Nature and the Environment Agency, together with local nature organisations such as the Essex Wildlife Trust, will be a key part of the process. Much of the coastline is a public right of way and as such the Public rights of Way team at Essex County Council will also need to be involved.</p> <p>That the policy remain unchanged:</p> <p>POLICY NR11 – CREATION OF INTERTIDAL HABITATS</p> <p>The creation of new intertidal habitats will be permitted provided it can be demonstrated through consultation with the appropriate bodies that the benefits of the proposed new habitats clearly outweigh the resultant loss of other natural habitats, agricultural or other land.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
9 – Shopping, advertisements and town centres	9.4	Shopping & town centres
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
136 – Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce - the respondent states that the new text should be removed and the vision should remain as per the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft).		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
There is no justification for the comments made, which relate to a factual statement.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>9.4 The Thames Gateway South East Partnership, in which the local authority is an active player, was launched in September 2001. It then issued a Vision Statement², which broke the partnership area into three distinct local authority areas. Southend and Rochford were joined to provide a focus on culture and education. The Vision has been undated by the more recent document <i>Delivering the future</i>³. This states that the key priorities for Rochford are:</p>		

² *A Vision for the Future* (2001), Thames Gateway South Essex

³ *Delivering the future* (2003), Thames Gateway South Essex

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
9 – Shopping, advertisements & town centres	SAT1	New retail, commercial & leisure development
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 81 - Southend-on-Sea BC - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY SAT1 - NEW RETAIL, COMMERCIAL AND LEISURE DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority shall adopt a sequential approach to consider the suitability of proposals for retail, commercial, public offices, entertainment, leisure and other such proposals. The preferred location for such proposals shall be within the Town Centre boundaries of Rayleigh, Rochford and Hockley, indicated on the Proposal Maps, followed by edge-of-centre sites, district and local centres, and out-of-centre sites. Having demonstrated a need for any retail development proposals, applications for retail and other such development as covered by this policy outside a town centre, will be determined having regard to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The availability of any alternative site or sites (whether allocated for the proposed use, or otherwise) within a Town Centre. Applicants must be flexible in terms of format, design and scale of their development; ii) the quantitative and qualitative need for the amount of floorspace proposed; iii) the likely impact of the development on the vitality and viability of existing town centres, including the evening economy, and on the rural economy; iv) the accessibility of the application site by a choice of means of transport; v) the likely effect of the proposal on overall travel patterns and car use; and, vi) the likely harm of the proposal to the foregoing strategy. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
9 – Shopping, advertisements & town centres	SAT7	Shopfronts: design & security
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>136 – Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce - the respondent states that new shopfronts can be designed without the need for shutters, but this is not always possible with those that exist. SAT7 does not give sufficient assurance to local traders that the security of their premises is a priority for the Council.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The Council is committed to ensuring a safe, secure and welcoming environment for residents, visitors and traders. Shutters can give rise to a siege mentality and fear that the risk of crime is greater than it actually is. Alternatives are available to traders to secure their premises without significant adverse visual intrusion.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY SAT7 - SHOPFRONTS: DESIGN AND SECURITY</p> <p>Shopfronts should be designed to complement the style and proportions of the affected building, and to those adjoining it. Shopfront designs should also incorporate any features necessary to ensure the security of the premises, and its contents.</p> <p>Planning permission for the installation of external roller shutters or grilles will only be granted where these do not cause an adverse impact on the appearance of the building to which they are to be attached or its locality. Where, exceptionally, shutters or grilles are permitted, they should comply with the guidance of LPSPG8.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10 - Utilities	10.2	Water - supply
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 85 – Ms G Yeadell – the respondent objects to this policy and suggests cutting back on redevelopment in south east Essex and by altering the types of housing approved to smaller units.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The comments are noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>WATER - SUPPLY</p> <p>10.2 The Essex Supply Zone is already in deficit, as more water is required than is available within the county. However, because of water transfer schemes and leakage and water use minimisation, the Essex and Suffolk Water Company foresees no major problems concerning the provision of supply to the new sites included in the Local Plan for housing and industrial development, as these are located in existing developed areas. However, there may need to be reinforcement of the network to ensure that there is no adverse effect on existing customers.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10 - Utilities	10.3	Water - supply
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent states that the plan should contain a general requirement to consider water supply and include water efficiency measures in all developments.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The comments are noted and incorporated.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the paragraph be changed as follows:		
<p>10.3 At the time of the First Review there were problems with reservoir levels due to low rainfall resulting in restrictions on water usage. However, changing weather patterns since the mid-1990s have led to the recharging of groundwater supplies and reservoirs and this, coupled to less water wastage have alleviated the need for restrictions. <u>Developers must consider the implications of their development on water supply and should consult with suppliers prior to submission. Developers must also include water efficiency and conservation in their schemes, in line with sustainable development principles.</u></p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10 - Utilities	10.6	Water – drainage
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
WATER - DRAINAGE		
10.6	PPG 25 requires adequate flow restriction arrangements to be made for surface water drainage in all cases where flood risk may be increased. Surface water discharges from newly developed sites should therefore be attenuated to current run-off rates for all storm events up to that of a 1% annual probability of occurrence (1 in 100 years). It may be possible to overcome the need for mechanical surface water attenuation devices by the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, provided that ground conditions are suitable. These should always be investigated as the primary method of flow restriction and mitigation.	

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10	10.7	Water – drainage
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – the respondent continues to support the objective of on-site attenuation.		
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>10.7 The Environment Agency will assist by advising on these techniques and scoping the options, which may include mechanical methods where ground conditions necessitate. Development adversely affecting flood risk may be required to carry out on- and off-site works to alleviate any detriment. However, on-site attenuation must be considered as the primary method of dealing with surface water drainage issues.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10	10.8	Water – drainage
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>10.8 The publication of Planning Policy Guidance Note 25 (Development and Flood Risk) has strengthened the consideration of flooding and drainage issues and all details should be included as part of the planning application to prove that the development will not be at risk of flooding nor increase the risk of flooding off-site. There is now considerable emphasis placed on such issues as flood risk assessment and sustainable urban drainage. The local planning authority will determine applications in floodplains on the basis of policies in Chapter 8 - Natural Resources and PPG25. The local planning authority will also require developers to show that they have considered sustainable urban drainage schemes in their design proposals as a move towards sustainable development.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10	10.9	Water – drainage
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>10.9 As a general rule, the Environment Agency requires a strip of land 9 metres in width adjacent to all <i>main river watercourses</i> to give clear, unobstructed access for heavy plant and machinery required for maintenance or improvement purposes. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for works within 9 metres of the top of the bank of a main river or a tidal or fluvial flood defence (under the terms of the <i>Water Resources Act 1991</i> and the <i>Land Drainage Byelaws</i>).</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 - Utilities	UT1	Foul & surface water requirements
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period. 85 – Ms G Yeadell - the respondent offers their support for this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>POLICY UT1 - FOUL & SURFACE WATER REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>When considering proposals for new development or changes of use, the local planning authority will take account of the availability and capacity of foul and surface water sewers and sewage treatment works, together with any increased risk of flooding from greater discharges from such works. In some instances it may be necessary for developers to enter into agreements with Anglian Water to phase development.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10	10.16	Electricity
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
31 – National Grid Transco – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>10.16 No significant land requirements are anticipated by National Grid (e.g. for major transformer sites), but land for sub-stations (3m x 3m) will be required in new building projects, details of which should be established at an early stage by individual developers. Effective siting of new development can yield amenity benefits to potential occupiers and the local community. Existing apparatus must therefore be taken into account when planning new development.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10	10.17	Electricity
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>31 – National Grid Transco – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>145 – Rayleigh Civic Society – the respondent states that the deleted text should be reinstated.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The comments are noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>10.17 Environmental improvements are to be encouraged, especially in the Conservation Areas, town and village centres, Nature Conservation Zones, Special Landscape Areas and Landscape Improvement Areas. In view of the substantial practical, technical and cost disadvantages involved, the undergrounding of high voltage power lines (275kV and above) will only be sought in exceptional circumstances. Careful routeing will usually be the most appropriate way to minimise the impact of high voltage power lines. National Grid will be encouraged to dismantle all disused overhead line systems and their associated supporting structures.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 - Utilities	UT3	Renewable energy
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – the respondent continues to support this policy. 61 - Environment Agency - the respondent offers their support for this policy. 73 – RSPB - the respondent offers their support for this policy. 80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY UT3 - RENEWABLE ENERGY Proposals for the development of renewable sources of energy, or proposals which include some element of renewable energy, will be encouraged, particularly where there are benefits to the local community. Renewable energy proposals will be permitted provided that the proposed development would not adversely affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The special character of the Coastal Protection Belt, Special Landscape Areas, Areas of Ancient Landscape or sites of nature conservation (including avian flyways) or heritage conservation interest; and ii. The amenity of nearby dwellings or residential areas; <p>The development must not result in a significant level of visual impact and particular regard will be had to the cumulative impact of existing, planned or proposed renewable energy developments.</p> <p>Proposals for development must be accompanied by adequate information to indicate the extent of possible environmental effects and how they can be satisfactorily mitigated.</p> <p>Minor domestic renewable energy schemes will be encouraged providing they meet criteria i and ii.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 - Utilities	UT4	Telecommunications development
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the phrase 'having regard to' does not provide certainty. Supporting text should be included which clarifies this.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The recommendation is partially accepted and the end of the policy has been re-worded to reflect this.		
RECOMMENDATION		
Change the policy as follows:		
<p>POLICY UT4 - TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Proposals for telecommunications equipment must first consider the sharing of masts and sites, in order to reduce the proliferation of such structures. Where it can be proved that this is not possible telecommunications development requiring an application for prior approval of siting and appearance will only be permitted where the equipment is sited, is of a design, material and colour, and where appropriate is screened, so as to minimise visual intrusion, taking account of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The need for the facility to blend more easily with its surroundings; ii. Whether the design is suited to the local environment; iii. The height in relation to surrounding land; iv. The impact on the topography and natural vegetation; v. The impact on the skyline or horizon; vi. Views into the site; vii. The site's scenic or conservation value; viii. Relationship with other existing masts, structures or buildings; and ix. Relationship to residential property, educational and healthcare facilities, employment and recreational sites; and x. Arrangements put in place to ensure that, if such development falls into disuse, any structures are removed and the land restored to its condition before development took place or other agreed beneficial use. <p><u>Any</u> These criteria will be applied having regard to the technical and operational constraints faced by telecommunications operators and the details of the benefits of the telecommunications development <u>must be submitted to the LPA at the time of application in the wider sense.</u></p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 - Utilities	UT5	Healthcare provision
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – the respondent states the revised policy must include an undertaking that mental health treatment in the central part of the town will not be allowed to adversely affect its wellbeing, or that of its residents and businesses.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The comments are noted, but this is not a matter for the local plan.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY UT5 - HEALTHCARE PROVISION Land zoned for healthcare purposes on the proposals maps will be safeguarded for such uses. No alternative uses will be considered acceptable by the local planning authority.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10	10.37	Education
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
78 – ECC (Schools Service) – the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
No comment.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>EDUCATION</p> <p>10.37 Essex County Council have proposed to erect a new primary school on part of the Park School site, but no need is foreseen for other new sites during the plan period. However, the LPA will adopt Supplementary Planning Guidance on developer contributions to ensure appropriate contributions are made towards new education provision. The redevelopment of the Park School site for a mixed use development incorporating a new primary school, means that Rawreth Primary School will may become redundant at some stage. The current school lies in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there would be restrictions on the types of use and development that may be appropriate.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10	10.38	Education
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
78 – ECC (Schools Service) – the respondent supports the changes removing any specific educational use, but still objects to the preference for educational or community uses.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The comments are duly noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No change:		
<p>10.38 The most appropriate use for the school would be continued educational use. Following this type of use, some form of community use would be the preferred option. The redevelopment of the site for residential purposes is regarded as a last resort, only to be explored once all other options have been investigated, given the green belt location of the site.</p>		

CHAPTER	PARAGRAPH	TITLE
10 - Utilities	10.44	Notifiable installations
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 - GO-East - the respondent states that in the interests of a shorter plan, they would question the need for this paragraph.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The Health and Safety Executive requested the insertion of this paragraph. As the government's advisers on this area it is considered that the text is relevant and necessary.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>The area covered by this Local Plan already contains a number of installations handling notifiable substances, including pipelines. Whilst they are subject to stringent controls under existing health and safety legislation, it is considered prudent to control the kinds of development permitted in the vicinity of these installations. For this reason the planning Authority has been advised by the Health and Safety Executive of consultation distances for each of these installations. In determining whether or not to grant planning permission for a proposed development within these consultation distances the Planning Authority will consult the Health and Safety Executive about risks to the proposed development from the notifiable installation in accordance with Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions Circular 04/2000.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
11 - Pollution	PN7	Light pollution
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – EWT – the respondent continues to support this policy.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>85 – Ms G Yeadell - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>137 – CPREssex – the respondent believes that the re-wording of this policy has made it weaker.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The comments by CPREssex are noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>No change:</p> <p>POLICY PN7 - LIGHT POLLUTION</p> <p>Details of any lighting scheme required as part of any new development should be submitted as part of the planning application. Applicants will be expected to demonstrate that the scheme proposed is the minimum needed for security and working purposes. Schemes that cause glare and / or spillage, which adversely affects criteria i to iv will be refused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Residential and commercial areas; ii. Areas of nature conservation interest; iii. Highway safety; and iv. The night sky. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
PROPOSALS MAPS		
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>9 – Maldon District Council – The respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>32 – EWT – the respondent objects to the incorrect boundaries of a number of Wildlife Sites on the proposals maps.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – the respondent objects to the incorrect boundaries and omissions relating to Wildlife Sites.</p> <p>81 - Southend-on-Sea BC - the respondent withdraws their representation made during the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) public consultation period.</p> <p>175 – Peter & Spencer Welsh – maintain their original objection to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft).</p> <p>210 – Mr R Pryor – the respondent requests that the area of the Ashingdon Park Estate be taken from the green belt and allocated as existing residential.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The comments are duly noted.		
RECOMMENDATION		
No changes be made.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
PROPOSALS MAP A		West of the district
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>26 – Powergen – are supportive of this policy which allows residential development within the existing residential areas, as defined on the proposals maps.</p> <p>80 - GO-East - the respondent states that the map does not show areas of flood risk, as required by paragraph 51 of PPG25.</p> <p>89 – George Wimpey (East London) Ltd – the respondent states that the proposals map includes land at Wellington Road in Rayleigh within the green belt and this should be removed as it does not serve the purposes of the green belt as laid out in PPG2.</p> <p>211 – Mr I Edwards – the respondent states there is an error with regard to the extent of the public open space on land adjacent to 62 Park Gardens in Hawkwell.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>With regard to the boundary of the public open space in the vicinity of 62 Park Gardens in Hawkwell, this error has been corrected and is believed to be correct in the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (Second Deposit) Draft.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>Further investigative work to be undertaken and the boundary amended if necessary.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
GLOSSARY		Wildlife Sites
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – EWT – the respondent seeks that Wildlife Sites are defined as 'A non-statutory site of local nature conservation importance, identified by the Essex Wildlife Trust and adopted by Rochford District Council (see policy NR5).'		
209 – ECC (PROW) – the respondent states that the definition of PROW needs updating as Essex no longer has an RUPPs (roads used as public paths).		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The two items will be amended in line with the representations.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the definitions be changed as follows:		
<p>Public Right of Way - a way where the public has a right to walk, and in some cases ride horses, bicycles, motorcycles or drive motor vehicles, which will be designated either as a footpath, a bridleway, a road used as a public path (RUPP) or a byway.</p> <p>Wildlife Site - A non-statutory site of local nature conservation importance, identified by the Essex Wildlife Trust and adopted by Rochford District Council (see policy NR5). These were formerly known as County Wildlife Sites or Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation.</p>		

OLD PARAGRAPHS THAT RESPONDENTS WISH TO SEE REINSTATED

RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS
9 – Maldon District Council – the respondent objects to the deletion of policy NR6 from the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (Second Deposit) Draft.
32 – EWT – the respondent objects to the deletion of policy NR4 from the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (Second Deposit) Draft.
42 – English Nature – the respondent objects to the deletion of policies NR6 & NR7 from the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (Second Deposit) Draft.
61 - Environment Agency - the respondent objects to the deletion of policy NR7 from the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (Second Deposit) Draft.
73 – RSPB – the respondent objects to the deletion of policies NR6 & NR7 from the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (Second Deposit) Draft.
104 - English Heritage - the respondent objects to the deletion of policy BC6 from the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (Second Deposit) Draft.
137 – CPREssex – the respondent objects to the deletion of policies NR4, NR6 & NR7 from the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (Second Deposit) Draft.
OFFICER'S COMMENTS
The comments are duly noted.
RECOMMENDATION
No change.