

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
1 – INTRODUCTION & CORE STRATEGIES	CS1	Moving Towards Sustainable Development
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>2 respondents supported this policy.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – suggest new wording: “The local planning authority will improve and enhance the environmental wealth of the district by...”</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the core strategies be removed as they are statements of intent and not land use policies.</p> <p>105 – Westbury Homes – suggest that policy CS1 be expanded to include a locational hierarchy for development as a move towards sustainable development.</p> <p>121 – BT plc – state that the policy is unreasonable, as it requires developers to enhance rather than to maintain the environment.</p> <p>133 – House Builders Federation – suggest new wording: “The Local Planning Authority will improve and enhance the environment of the district by permitting development that is environmentally, socially and economically sustainable.”</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a robust opening chapter that is aspirational in its intent to ensure that appropriate high quality development takes place in a sustainable fashion. The removal of this policy or its removal to supporting text would undermine the general thrust that is continued through the whole local plan. However, the inclusion of the extra text suggested by English Nature will increase the inclusivity of the policy and this minor amendment is recommended.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be amended to:</p> <p>CS1 – MOVING TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT The local planning authority will improve and enhance the <u>environmental wealth</u> of the district by requiring development to be undertaken in the most environmentally, socially and economically sustainable way.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
1 – INTRODUCTION & CORE STRATEGIES	CS2	Protecting and enhancing the built and natural environment
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>4 respondents supported this policy.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the core strategies be removed as they are statements of intent and not land use policies.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a robust opening chapter that is aspirational in its intent to ensure that appropriate high quality development takes place in a sustainable fashion. The removal of this policy or its removal to supporting text would undermine the general thrust that is continued through the whole local plan. No change is therefore recommended.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be retained as:</p> <p>CS2 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE BUILT AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The local planning authority will protect, sustain and enhance the district's natural resources and cultural heritage through the application of the policies and proposals in the plan for future generations to enjoy and to ensure that new development contributes to environmental quality.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
1 – INTRODUCTION & CORE STRATEGIES	CS3	Reducing the need to travel
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>12 – SE Essex Friends of the Earth – agree that housing should be mainly located in urban areas, close to facilities and services, but that brownfield sites are not always a sustainable option.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the core strategies be removed as they are statements of intent and not land use policies.</p> <p>133 – House Builders Federation – suggest new wording: “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 will be permitted.”</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a robust opening chapter that is aspirational in its intent to ensure that appropriate high quality development takes place in a sustainable fashion. The removal of this policy or its removal to supporting text would undermine the general thrust that is continued through the whole local plan. It is believed that the suggestion put forward by the House Builders Federation is more positive and it is recommended that this be accepted.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be replaced with:</p> <p>CS3 - REDUCING THE NEED TO TRAVEL The local planning authority will ensure that development reduces the length, number and duration of motorised journeys, particularly at peak hours and that it encourages the use of alternative modes of transport to help protect the quality of the built and urban environment. <u>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 will be permitted.</u></p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
1 – INTRODUCTION & CORE STRATEGIES	CS4	Accessible and high quality housing and services
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>80 – GoEast – state that the core strategies be removed as they are statements of intent and not land use policies.</p> <p>84 – Bellway Homes – state that the policy is unduly restrictive. The final line of the policy should be reworded to allow for the redevelopment of existing sites where they are harmful in terms of amenity / traffic generation, highway safety and visual impact.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a robust opening chapter that is aspirational in its intent to ensure that appropriate high quality development takes place in a sustainable fashion. The removal of this policy or its removal to supporting text would undermine the general thrust that is continued through the whole local plan. It is believed that the suggestion put forward by Bellway Homes can indeed add a more positive thrust to the policy and it is recommended that this be accepted.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be reworded to:</p> <p>CS4 - ACCESSIBLE AND HIGH QUALITY HOUSING AND SERVICES The local planning authority will promote more compact patterns of development on all types of site through use of appropriate densities, which minimise land requirements, and mixed-use developments, which provide more balanced, better integrated housing, employment, education, shopping, leisure and other community facilities in closer proximity. Development that is poorly located with respect to services will not be acceptable, <u>unless it can be proven that the development would resolve existing safety, amenity or environmental problems.</u></p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
1 – INTRODUCTION & CORE STRATEGIES	CS5	Accessible and high quality housing and services
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
1 respondent supported this policy. 80 – GoEast – state that the core strategies be removed as they are statements of intent and not land use policies.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The policy forms part of a robust opening chapter that is aspirational in its intent to ensure that appropriate high quality development takes place in a sustainable fashion. The removal of this policy or its removal to supporting text would undermine the general thrust that is continued through the whole local plan.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be retained as: CS5 - ENCOURAGING ECONOMIC REGENERATION The local planning authority will: a. Work in partnership to consolidate the local economy and attract new investment; and b. Allocate land for industrial and commercial uses, whilst striving to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town and village centres as attractive places to visit and shop.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
1 – INTRODUCTION & CORE STRATEGIES	CS6	Promoting good design and design statements
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>12 – SE Essex Friends of the Earth – concerned that urgent (respondent's emphasis) "careful consideration must be given to the design of all new development" as this has not been the case with regard to recent developments in the district.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – suggest additional text for criterion 'a', thus: "a. Takes account of the existing form, nature <u>and biodiversity</u> of the site and its surroundings;"</p> <p>84 – Bellway Homes – state that PPG1 advises that LPAs should encourage (respondent's emphasis) and not dictate that it must happen on every site. The policy is therefore too onerous. The policy should therefore state that the LPA encourages good design and that planning applications propose designs which take account of the factors listed as a) to d).</p> <p>95 – Barratt Eastern Counties – suggest that the wording "good quality design" should be used rather than "design of the highest quality". This is in line with government guidance.</p> <p>108 – Berkeley Leisure Group – state that the policy advocates a greater test than that advocated in PPG1 and that the policy should contain the words "design of good quality" rather than "design of the highest quality".</p> <p>133 – House Builders Federation – state that the requirement for design statements for all developments is too onerous.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a robust opening chapter that is aspirational in its intent to ensure that appropriate high quality development takes place in a sustainable fashion. The removal of this policy or its removal to supporting text would undermine the general thrust that is continued through the whole local plan. It is believed that the suggestions put forward to alter wording to reflect government guidance more tightly is appropriate. It is considered that the suggestion by English Nature is not appropriate, but that confusion has arisen over the use of the word 'nature' and that this should be replaced with the word 'character'. It is not considered that the requirement for design statements is too onerous as it will not apply to all sites, as specified in policies HP4 and EB9 and LPSPG5. It is recommended that the policy be subject to minor rewording.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be reworded to:</p> <p>CS6 - PROMOTING GOOD DESIGN AND DESIGN STATEMENTS The local planning authority will only approve development proposals that demonstrate <u>good quality design</u> of the highest quality which:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Takes into account the existing form and <u>nature character</u> of the site and its surroundings; Relates to the locality in terms of scale, layout, proportion, materials and detailing; Includes landscaping arrangements which reduce the visual impact of and positively enhance the proposal and its surroundings; and 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	POLICY	TITLE
1 – INTRODUCTION & CORE STRATEGIES	CS7	Conserving and enhancing heritage
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 – GoEast – state that the core strategies be removed as they are statements of intent and not land use policies.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The policy forms part of a robust opening chapter that is aspirational in its intent to ensure that appropriate high quality development takes place in a sustainable fashion. The removal of this policy or its removal to supporting text would undermine the general thrust that is continued through the whole local plan.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be retained as:		
CS7 - CONSERVING AND ENHANCING HERITAGE The local planning authority will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Conserve and enhance buildings and their settings and areas of architectural and historic significance; Conserve, protect and enhance green spaces, hard landscaped spaces, as well as spaces between buildings that make a contribution to an area or the district; and Encourage a high standard of design for new development that respects and enhances the environmental quality and character of the district's urban and rural heritage. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
1 – INTRODUCTION & CORE STRATEGIES	CS9	Emphasising the value of landscaping
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>2 respondents supported this policy.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the policy is not a strategic issue and therefore should be removed.</p> <p>133 – House Builders Federation – states that the requirement of the policy is too onerous with regard to smaller schemes and that the policy should be reworded to exclude such.</p> <p>191 – Ms G Yeadell – states that the policy is a pious wish not carried out in practice. There is no need for the policy if it is not carried out in practice.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a robust opening chapter that is aspirational in its intent to ensure that appropriate high quality development takes place in a sustainable fashion. The removal of this policy or its removal to supporting text would undermine the general thrust that is continued through the whole local plan. It is recommended that a minor alteration be made to state the developments that the policy relates to.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be retained as:</p> <p>CS9 - EMPHASISING THE VALUE OF LANDSCAPING The local planning authority will require the submission of a landscape scheme as a condition of planning consent for sites as defined within <u>policies HP4, EB9 and the LPSPG5</u>, regarding Design Statements.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT1	Rural issues
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
42 – English Nature – insert word 'biodiversity'		
80 – GoEast – A more positive criteria based policy would be more appropriate		
32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – insert 'nature conservation interests'		
143 – Sport England – policy too negative, new wording suggested		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Support the proposal for wording the policy in a more positive light and acknowledging biodiversity.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be amended to:		
LT1 – RURAL ISSUES Any leisure and tourism proposals in rural areas will be supported provided that has an adverse material affect on the rural landscape, biodiversity or 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 will be refused.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT2	Synthetic sports pitch provision
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 – GoEast – Suggest supporting text rather than policy		
32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – insert 'nature conservation interests'		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree with acknowledging nature conservation interests but disagree that the provision of a sports pitch should not be a policy as the 'Assessment of Playing Pitches in the Rochford District (October 2002) highlighted it as an important need.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be amended to:		
LT2 – SYNTHETIC SPORTS PROVISION		
<p>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 <u>and nature conservation interests</u>.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT3	Public playing pitch provision
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – insert 'nature conservation interests'		
133 – House Builders Federation – re Circular 1/97 – maintenance payments should not normally be sought.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree with acknowledging nature conservation interests. There is concern in the provision of any new facilities to ensure that provision can be made for future maintenance. However, whilst it is accepted that this goes beyond the limits for conditions on a planning consent, it may nevertheless still be possible to secure a maintenance contribution as part of a 106 agreement.		
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 <u>and have regard to LPSPG10</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The 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, <u>nature conservation interests</u> or the character of the countryside; vi. <u>The Local Planning Authority</u> is satisfied that provision has been made for the area's long term retention and maintenance. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT4	Developer contributions
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
133 – House Builders Federation – re Circular 1/97 – say policy is legally incorrect. 80 – GoEast – Unclear if it would meet policy tests in Circular 1/97. 121 – BT – Planning obligations should only be sought when they meet criteria of Circular 1/97. 70 – Swan Hill Homes – LT4 is dealt with under policy HP6		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree to delete policy from Leisure and Tourism chapter and to consider the introduction of a generic policy dealing with developer contributions.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the Policy LT4 be deleted		
NEW POLICY – DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS To be submitted at a future committee		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT5	Cherry Orchard Jubilee Country Park
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – supported policy</p> <p>81 - Southend-on-Sea B.C. – Should seek to consolidate and close 'gaps' and map should show that the Country Park is in the Green Belt.</p> <p>14 – Lansbury Holdings Ltd. – object to their land holding falling within proposed Country Park and wishes designation of Cherry Orchard Way removed from proposed Country Park.</p> <p>185 – Vez Ltd. – Wishes land owned by them to be removed from proposed Country Park designation.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>Agree to seek consolidation of gaps – the country park is in the Green Belt, but the notation on the draft map is not ideal. The Council has a long standing aim to develop the Country Park for the benefit of the whole community and therefore does not agree to remove any land identified for that purpose from the proposed designation.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the map be improved to ensure it is clear that the country park is on the Green Belt and the policy remain unchanged as:</p> <p>POLICY LT5 – CHERRY ORCHARD JUBILEE COUNTRY PARK The Council will establish and retain a country park on the area of land between Rayleigh and Rochford as identified on the proposals map.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT7	New public open space
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>2 respondents supported the policy.</p> <p>80 - GoEast – in the interests of certainty and clarity remove from (iv) “The Local Planning Authority is satisfied”.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree to make amendment to criteria (iv).		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be amended to:</p> <p>POLICY LT7 - NEW PUBLIC OPEN SPACE</p> <p>New proposals for informal open space in addition to those allocated in LT5 will be required to meet all of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The location should have easy pedestrian access from the defined settlement it serves; ii. It should not have an adverse impact on residential amenity or the character of the countryside; iii. The proposed area is for public use and should remain so in perpetuity; iv. The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that pProvision has been made for the area's long term retention and maintenance; v. The proposal should provide a local facility in scale with the community it serves; and vi. Existing natural features should be retained and enhanced with the implementation of a landscaping scheme involving the planting of native species. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT8	Private open space
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>2 respondents supported the policy.</p> <p>80 - GoEast – in the interests of certainty delete “not normally be allowed”.</p> <p>143 – Sport England – in line with PPG17, should not differentiate between ‘private’ and ‘public’.</p> <p>133 – House Builders Federation – use of the word ‘normally’ is contrary to good practice.</p> <p>78 – ECC Schools Services – The policy is too restrictive and does not allow schools the flexibility government is now suggesting.</p> <p>70 – Swan Hill Homes Ltd. – wish to add the word ‘quality’ after ‘development for other purpose of existing...’ and add the words ‘where they contribute to the character of the settlement’ after ‘will not normally be allowed’.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>Agree to make all amendments apart from respondent 70 whose suggested amendments become superfluous once the other amendments have been made.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be amended to:</p> <p>POLICY LT8 – PUBLIC AND PRIVATE OPEN SPACE</p> <p><u>Development for other purposes of Only in exceptional circumstances where development is unavoidable will the Council consider the suitability of the loss of existing private 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. will not normally be allowed. If there are exceptional circumstances where development is unavoidable an equivalent or better area of land for the same use must be provided to serve the community.</u></p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT9	Safeguarding open space
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – insert 'are of importance for nature conservation' after 'high townscape value'		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree with acknowledging nature conservation interests and agree to insert where suggested.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be amended to:</p> <p>POLICY LT9 – 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, <u>are of importance for nature conservation</u> 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.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT10	Indoor sports & leisure facilities
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – insert ‘ or other sites of Special Scientific Interest’		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree with adding words suggested.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be amended to:		
<p>POLICY LT10 – INDOOR SPORTS & LEISURE FACILITIES 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. Will 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, <u>or other Sites of nature conservation interest</u>, Special Landscape Areas and the Coastal Protection Belt. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT11	Children's play facilities
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
133 – House Builders Federation – policy makes no mention of size of housing schemes and should have regard to Circular 1/97.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Re size of housing schemes – add reference to LPSPG 1. Amend the final clause.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be amended to:		
<p>POLICY LT11 - CHILDREN'S PLAY FACILITIES</p> <p>The council will seek opportunities to provide and improve children's play space having special regard to the needs of older children.</p> <p>On new housing schemes developers will provide:</p> <p>a) A play space in accordance with the adopted standards of the District Council's criteria contained in LPSPG1; or</p> <p>b) Enhancement of existing play space where all or part of the proposed development lies within 400m of the centre of existing play space; or</p> <p>c) A combination of (a) and (b); or</p> <p>Where the above cannot be fulfilled, <u>the LPA will seek to negotiate a commuted sum from developers</u> for the provision or enhancement of children's play space.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT12	New play space provision
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>133 – House Builders Federation – policy should have regard to Circular 1/97 – maintenance payments should not normally be sought.</p> <p>32 - Essex Wildlife Trust – should include reference to nature conservation interests.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Regarding Circular 1/97 – take out (c). Include reference to nature conservation interests in (d).		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be amended to:</p> <p>POLICY LT12 – 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) A commuted sum is provided for the long term maintenance of the open space; d) It will not have an adverse impact on residential amenity, <u>nature conservation interests</u> or the character of the countryside; e) <u>The play space</u> is for public use in perpetuity; f) Pedestrian access exists or will be provided via a footpath giving safe access to the site. <p>The LPA will also seek to negotiate a contribution from developers for the initial maintenance of the play space.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT15	Golf courses
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>3 respondents supported the policy.</p> <p>81 – Southend-on-Sea Borough Council – policy does not retain protection of Hockley Woods Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>162 – Mr. Roger Phipps – wants Michelin Farm to be allocated for golf/hotel facilities.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – Questions the need for a policy on golf courses, most of criteria are general matters.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>There is no justification for Michelin Farm to be allocated for golf/hotel facilities and taken out of the Green Belt. Agree with GoEast's suggestions and will change policy into a Statement of Intent. Hockley Woods is covered by 'Ancient Woodlands' in (i).</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be amended to a Statement of Intent:</p> <p>(Statement of Intent) - GOLF COURSES and extensions to Golf Courses 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	LT16	Horse riding facilities
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
180 – Hockley Parish Council – wants statement for provision of new bridleways and footpaths. 196 – Hockley Residents Assoc. – wants statement for provision of new bridleways and footpaths. 42 – English Nature – inclusion of reference to nature conservation interests. 32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – inclusion of reference to nature conservation interests.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
New bridleways and footpaths are covered under TP7 – Provision for Horseriding. Agree to add reference to nature conservation.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be amended to:</p> <p>POLICY LT16 – HORSE RIDING FACILITIES Proposals for horse related development will be granted planning permission provided that the following criteria are met:</p> <p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 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 to 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 be permitted; 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	LT17	Water recreation facilities
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
4 representations supported the policy. 129 – Essex Wildlife Trust (Southend & Rochford Group) - additional criteria for monitoring saltings and reference to Biodiversity Action Plan.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree to draw attention to the Rochford Biodiversity Action Plan. Saltings monitoring is covered in Natural Resources chapter.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the Rochford Biodiversity Action Plan is highlighted in paragraph. 6.43 of Chapter 6.		
6.43 The Local Planning Authority, when considering applications relating to water based recreation, will consult with the Crouch Harbour Authority (and their Harbour Management Plan), who have represented all interests on the rivers since 1975. <u>The Authority will also have regard to PPG25 (Development and Flood Risk) and the Rochford Biodiversity Action Plan.</u>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT18	Dry pits
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
2 representations supported the policy. 129 – Essex Wildlife Trust (Southend & Rochford Group) – An ecological survey should be undertaken before any planning permission is granted.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree to add amendments.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the Policy be amended to:		
<p>POLICY LT18 – DRY PITS 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) <u>an ecological survey is carried out;</u> d) <u>satisfactory access and parking provision must be achieved for the proposed use; and</u> 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	LT19	Tourism
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – clause (iii) to include nature conservation interests. 73 – RSPB – include nature conservation interests 80 – GoEast – Suggest criteria could be included in broader based policy and delete this policy.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree to add amendments regarding nature conservation. A policy for tourism is needed to encourage and promote tourism and thereby support the local economy.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the Policy be amended to: POLICY LT19 – TOURISM The council will encourage the provision of tourist attractions for visitors to the district through the granting of planning permission where: <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 <u>or nature conservation interests</u> will not be adversely affected; and iv. There will be no significant impact on local amenities 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT20	Rural tourism
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
154 – A. W.Squier Ltd. – concerned re reference to 'small-scale accommodation'. 129 – Essex Wildlife Trust – requirement for bat survey. 194 – Canewdon Parish Council – policy should have negative approach to tourist accommodation.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Agree to make amendments regarding small-scale accommodation and requirement for bat survey. Policy should not have a negative approach to tourist accommodation as the Council wish to encourage tourism in the Rochford District.		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the Policy be amended to:</p> <p>POLICY LT20 – RURAL TOURISM</p> <p>1. The change of use and/or conversion of existing buildings in the countryside to small-scale accommodation for leisure or tourism related facilities will be permitted, provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The proposal re-uses a building constructed of permanent materials with a reasonable expectation of life; ii. the proposal maintains or enhances the rural environment and the landscape character of the area. iii. Provision can be made for the parking of guests' vehicles within the farm complex, or on the 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. iv. A bat survey is undertaken. <p>2. 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.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT21	New hotel accommodation
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
1 respondent supported policy 140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – object to restrictions of locations in policy. 162 – Mr Roger Phipps - Land at Michelin Farm be allocated for hotel and leisure accommodation.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
Disagree with objections regarding restriction of locations in policy.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the Policy be retained: POLICY LT21 – NEW HOTEL ACCOMMODATION Proposals for new hotel accommodation will be considered favourably within the defined settlement boundaries of Rayleigh, Rochford and Rawreth.		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT22	Touring caravans & tents
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>137 – CPREssex – States that the sites are not shown on the proposals maps as stated in the policy. Suggest rewording the policy, thus: “No new sites or extensions to existing sites will be permitted. Environmental improvements within existing sites will be encouraged.”</p> <p>149 – Barling Magna Parish Council – aligns itself with the comments made by CPREssex.</p> <p>150 – Sutton Parish Council – aligns itself with the comments made by CPREssex.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The caravan sites throughout the district are indicated on the proposals maps, although the map key refers to policy HP22 and not LT22. This will be amended. Policy HP22 covers the information suggested by the first point made by the respondents and the second point is worthy of inclusion. Therefore it is recommended that be policy be amended.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the Policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY LT22 – 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></p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
6 – LEISURE & TOURISM	LT23	Sports causing noise or disturbance
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>4 respondents supported this policy.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the policy should be deleted and replaced by a criterion based policy covering a range of land uses.</p> <p>143 – Sport England – state that the policy is too negatively worded and that it should be revised to encourage leisure uses in rural areas, subject to criteria being met, thus: “Leisure and tourism proposals in rural areas will be supported provided the rural landscape or character of the area will not be adversely affected by reason of the size, scale and design of the proposal or the intensity of use.”</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>Both respondents have valid points and most respondents were in support of the existing policy. However, the suggested alteration to a criteria based policy would strengthen the policy, without altering its direction. Therefore it is recommended that the policy be amended.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the Policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY LT23 – SPORTS CAUSING NOISE OR DISTURBANCE Proposals for sport or leisure facilities and activities likely to cause noise or disturbance <u>will be refused, unless it is proven that there are no adverse effects on:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>occupiers of nearby residential properties/plots;</u> b) <u>existing flora and fauna (for example overwintering birds); or</u> c) <u>traffic impact or highway safety</u> <p><u>by virtue of the scale, siting, design, construction or operation of the activity.</u></p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
9 – SHOPPING, ADVERTISEMENTS & TOWN CENTRES	SAT1	New retail, commercial and leisure development
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>1 respondent was in support of the policy.</p> <p>55 – Morley fund Management – suggest the rewording of criterion i thus: “the availability of any suitable site (whether allocated for the proposed use, or otherwise) within a Town Centre.”</p> <p>The respondent also wishes for the replacement of the third sentence with the following text: “Having demonstrated 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> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the policy is superfluous as it simply repeats the contents of PPG6.</p> <p>81 – Southend-on-Sea Borough Council – state that the policy fails to require a demonstration of the need for development and is therefore out of step with national planning policy.</p> <p>141 – Alsop Verrill – state that the area at the west end of West Street, Rochford should remain as a secondary shopping area. The boundary should therefore be amended to include this area, as per the Rochford District Local Plan (First Review).</p> <p>159 – Royal Mail – state the policy is erroneous as it no town centres are defined on the proposals maps.</p> <p>178 – Somerfield Stores Ltd – state that the policy fails to make it clear that when applying the sequential test developers should look at alternative store formats. The respondent suggests an additional criterion: “the quantitative and qualitative need for the amount of floorspace proposed;”</p> <p>The respondent also identifies additional text for criterion i, thus: “the availability of any alternative site, <u>or sites</u> (whether allocated for the proposed use or otherwise) within a town centre. <u>Applicants must be flexible in terms of the format, design and scale of their development;</u>”</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a chapter that seeks to ensure that new and existing development is sustainable and that the vitality and viability of existing town centres. The chapter also seeks to ensure that the urban environment reinforces these aims.</p> <p>The representation by the Royal Mail is not material, as the town centres are not been defined in the Rochford District Local Plan (First Review) and no problems have arisen from this. To draw a line on a map to show the town centre boundary would not be robust, it would be arbitrary and open to challenge. The representation from Alsop Verrill is also rejected. The area at the west end of West Street has been removed from the secondary shopping area, as it no longer contains any significant retail element. There is no justification for it continued inclusion.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
9 – SHOPPING, ADVERTISEMENTS & TOWN CENTRES	SAT1	New retail, commercial and leisure development
<p>The representation from GoEast states that the policy reiterates central government guidance and should be deleted. Whilst there is some element of PPG6 found within the policy this is because the policy seeks to reflect government guidance onto local circumstances. No change is therefore required in response to this representation. Southend-on-Sea Borough Council state that a demonstration of need must be included within the policy. This is agreed with and it is recommended that a minor amendment reflect this.</p> <p>The representations from Morley Fund Management and Somerfield Stores Ltd deal in greater detail with the wording of the policy, rather than its general direction. It is recommended that amendments be made in the light of these representations. It is therefore recommended that the policy be reworded.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be reworded thus:</p> <p>POLICY SAT1 – NEW RETAIL, COMMERCIAL & LEISURE DEVELOPMENT 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. Any application proposing such development outside a Town Centre will be determined having regard to the following factors <u>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:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The availability of any alternative site, <u>or sites</u> (whether allocated for the proposed use or otherwise) within a town centre. <u>Applicants must be flexible in terms of the format, design and scale of their development.</u> ii) <u>the quantitative and qualitative need for the amount of floorspace proposed;</u> 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	SAT2	Rochford foodstore
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>2 respondents were in support of the policy.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that as they requested in an earlier representation, car parking standard should be included in the plan and not as an LPSPG.</p> <p>140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – states a concern between the relationship and conflict between retail and residential uses in terms of good neighbourliness. Also concern that there will not be enough car parking spaces.</p> <p>178 – Somerfields Stores Ltd – state that text within paragraph 9.8 refers to a retail study that concluded that the town could support a foodstore with a maximum floorspace of 1862m². They believe that this figure should be included in the policy for clarity.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a chapter that seeks to ensure that new and existing development is sustainable and that the vitality and viability of existing town centres. The chapter also seeks to ensure that the urban environment reinforces these aims.</p> <p>The concerns regarding the GoEast representation will be addressed elsewhere, but should the car parking standards be included as a policy within the local plan, then the text referring to LPSPG2 will be amended to relate to the specific policy. No response is required vis-à-vis the representation from the Essex Chambers of Commerce, although their concerns are noted, such detailing can be controlled through the use of appropriate conditions to ensure that the benefits of any development outweigh its disbenefits. Whilst Somerfields Stores Ltd make a valid point, there is no justification to reiterate the figures, as the supporting text has the same standing as the text within a policy. It is therefore recommended that the policy be retained.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be retained:</p> <p>POLICY SAT2 – ROCHFORD FOODSTORE</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority will assess proposals for a retail food store and associated mixed use development, including a new library, on the allocated site north of Market Square, Rochford against the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the proposal should exhibit a high standard of design, and utilise materials appropriate to this sensitive town centre location within a conservation area; ii) car parking should be provided in accordance with the standards set out in LPSPG2; iii) the proposal should make satisfactory provision for access, parking and servicing arrangements, with servicing to take place solely via Roche Close; 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
9 – SHOPPING, ADVERTISEMENTS & TOWN CENTRES	SAT2	Rochford foodstore
<p>iv) the proposal should be accompanied by detailed hard and soft landscaping and lighting schemes for the site and the accesses to it, particularly to ensure close integration of the site with the Market Square; and</p> <p>v) the provision of a pedestrian link to the Market Square should be an essential and integral part of the proposal.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
9 – SHOPPING, ADVERTISEMENTS & TOWN CENTRES	SAT7	Shop fronts: security and design
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>80 – GoEast – state that policies SAT7 and SAT8 should be combined.</p> <p>136 – Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce – state that the first priority is to have secure retail premises. Suggest that discussion should take place to ensure that security shutters when required in Conservation Areas should be of an appropriate design.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a chapter that seeks to ensure that new and existing development is sustainable and that the vitality and viability of existing town centres. The chapter also seeks to ensure that the urban environment reinforces these aims. Whilst agreeing in principle with the representation it would be inappropriate to discuss such designs generally at this stage. General advice is in fact provided by LPSPG8. Specific advice should be obtained during the pre-application stages. It is therefore recommended that the thrust of the policy be retained, but in accordance with the GoEast representation that policies SAT7 and SAT8 be combined.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be combined with current draft policy SAT8, as shown later.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
9 – SHOPPING, ADVERTISEMENTS & TOWN CENTRES	SAT8	Security shutters
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 – GoEast – state that policies SAT7 and SAT8 should be combined.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The policy forms part of a chapter that seeks to ensure that new and existing development is sustainable and that the vitality and viability of existing town centres. The chapter also seeks to ensure that the urban environment reinforces these aims. It is therefore recommended that the thrust of the policy be retained, but in accordance with the GoEast representation that policies SAT8 and SAT7 be combined.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be combined with current draft policy SAT7, thus.		
POLICY SAT7 – SHOPFRONTS: DESIGN AND SECURITY		
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. In this regard, attention is drawn to Policy SAT8 which follows. All applications should comply with the guidance of LPSPG8.		
POLICY SAT8 – SECURITY SHUTTERS		
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.		
<u>POLICY SAT?? – SHOPFRONTS: DESIGN & SECURITY</u>		
<u>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.</u>		
<u>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.</u>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
9 – SHOPPING, ADVERTISEMENTS & TOWN CENTRES	SAT10	Advertisements within Conservation Areas
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
135 – Rayleigh Town Council – state that traditional signs should be a requirement and not simply preferred.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The policy forms part of a chapter that seeks to ensure that new and existing development is sustainable and that the vitality and viability of existing town centres. The chapter also seeks to ensure that the urban environment reinforces these aims. Whilst agreeing in principle with the representation it would be inappropriate to restrict the type of advertisement, given that modern materials may be able to replicate traditional. It is the appearance and effect of the advertisement that is most important when considering any application for Advertisement Consent. It is therefore recommended that the policy be retained.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be retained:		
<p>POLICY SAT10 – ADVERTISEMENTS WITHIN CONSERVATION AREAS</p> <p>Within Conservation Areas the use of internally illuminated fascias and projecting box signs will not be permitted. Where illuminated signs are exceptionally permitted illumination shall take the form of spot lighting of hanging signs or other discreet forms of lighting. Traditional wooden, painted fascias and hanging signs will be preferred to coloured plastic fascias and boxes.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 – UTILITIES, HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES	UT1	Foul and surface water requirements
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>61 – Environment Agency – state that the policy should also relate to discharges from sewage treatment works.</p> <p>191 – Ms G Yeadell – states that she must object to this because of the council's failure to implement such a policy in the past.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a wide-ranging chapter that seeks to ensure that new and existing development is sustainable and that community and healthcare facilities are located appropriately. The comments made by the Environment Agency relate to the impacts of development, which need to be addressed through the policy. It is therefore recommended that the policy be reworded to incorporate this.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be reworded thus:</p> <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, <u>together with any increased risk of flooding from greater discharges from such works</u>. In some instances it may be necessary for developers to enter into agreements with Anglian Water to phase development.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 – UTILITIES, HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES	UT2	Non-mains disposal of foul water and sewage
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>1 respondent supported this policy.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that this policy simply reiterates government policy and so should be deleted.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a wide-ranging chapter that seeks to ensure that new and existing development are sustainable and that community and healthcare facilities are located appropriately. The comments made by the Environment Agency show support for a policy, whilst GoEast suggest the removal of the policy. However, the guidance provided by government in Circular 3/99 is not so strong as the policy, which seeks to ensure the protection of groundwater and the environment. It is therefore recommended to retain the policy.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be retained:</p> <p>POLICY UT2 – NON-MAINS DISPOSAL OF FOUL WATER & SEWAGE The local planning authority will refuse development that will not connect to mains sewerage, if it is not consistent with the guidance provided by Circular 3/99. Developers should provide evidence covering points (a) to (k) of Annex A to Circular 3/99 at the time of applying for permission.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 – UTILITIES, HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES	UT3	Renewable energy
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>2 respondents supported this policy.</p> <p>73 – RSPB – state that the cumulative development of wind turbines can have significant impacts on bird populations. Suggest additional text, thus:</p> <p>“There is also a need to assess whether turbines will affect any avian flyways and consultation will be undertaken with English Nature and the RSPB to assess the risk.”</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that whilst they support the policy it should also include renewable energy proposals that are part of a wider development proposal.</p> <p>132 – National Windpower Ltd – request the deletion of the penultimate paragraph of the policy.</p> <p>180 – Hockley Parish Council – state that the issue of domestic wind turbines should be included in this policy as a move towards sustainable development.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a wide-ranging chapter that seeks to ensure that new and existing development are sustainable and that community and healthcare facilities are located appropriately. The issue of windpower is controversial with respondents demonstrating the dichotomy of desire for the use of such technology against the impact (mainly visual) of implementation. There is no justification given the predominant low-lying nature of the district and the expansive semi-peripheral views obtained in the rural areas for the deletion of the penultimate paragraph of the policy as suggested by National Windpower Ltd.</p> <p>The comments made by Go-East and Hockley Parish Council are both worthy of further consideration and alterations to the policy have been undertaken to implement these. The comments made by the RSPB also warrant consideration, but a minor text amendment is deemed satisfactory to bring to the fore the point they make. It is recommended that the policy be reworded.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be reworded, thus:</p> <p>POLICY UT3 – RENEWABLE ENERGY</p> <p><u>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:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The special character of the Coastal Protection Belt, Special Landscape Areas, Areas of Ancient Landscape or sites of nature conservation or heritage conservation interest <u>or avian flyways</u>; and 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>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 – UTILITIES, HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES	UT3	Renewable energy
<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><u>Minor domestic renewable energy schemes will be encouraged providing they meet criteria i and ii.</u></p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 – UTILITIES, HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES	UT4	Telecommunication Development
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>28 – Orange Personal Communications – state that the policy fails to take into account technical constraints. Suggests the insertion of "...where technically feasible..." immediately after "following" in line 4 of the policy.</p> <p>121 – BT plc – state that the policy fails to take into account the technical and operational requirements with regard to the siting and appearance of equipment. Suggests that the following be added at the end of the policy:</p> <p>"These criteria will be applied having regard to the technical and operational constraints faced by telecommunications operators and the benefits of telecommunications development in the wider sense."</p> <p>137 – CPRESsex – suggests that the policy be amended to ensure that there is an avoidance of duplication of sites. Suggests the following wording:</p> <p>"Proposals for telecommunications development 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 notification..."</p> <p>149 – Barling Magna Parish Council – aligns itself with the comments made by CPRESsex.</p> <p>150 – Sutton Parish Council – aligns itself with the comments made by CPRESsex.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a wide-ranging chapter that seeks to ensure that new and existing development are sustainable and that community and healthcare facilities are located appropriately. The comments made by the telecommunications operators are valid and the final paragraph as suggested by BT plc should be added to the policy. The comments made by CPRESsex, Barling Magna and Sutton Parish Councils are also relevant as the text (paragraph 10.28) make reference to the need to ensure mast sharing and this should therefore be reflected in policy. It is therefore recommended that the policy be reworded.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be reworded thus:</p> <p>POLICY UT4 – TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT</p> <p><u>Proposals for telecommunications development 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:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The need for the facility to blend more easily with its surroundings; Whether the design is suited to the local environment; The height in relation to surrounding land; The impact on the topography and natural vegetation; The impact on the skyline or horizon; Views into the site; The site's scenic or conservation value; 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 – UTILITIES, HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES	UT4	Telecommunication Development
<p>viii. Relationship with other existing masts, structures or buildings;</p> <p>ix. Relationship to residential property, educational and healthcare facilities, employment and recreational sites; and</p> <p>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> <p><u>These criteria will be applied having regard to the technical and operational constraints faced by telecommunications operators and the benefits of telecommunications development in the wider sense.</u></p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 – UTILITIES, HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES	UT5	Healthcare provision
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – states that they seek a policy assurance that the intensity of mental health provision in Rochford will not adversely affect the town and its residents and businesses.</p> <p>155 – Southend Hospital NHS Trust – request that the Cherry Orchard Brickworks site be allocated for healthcare purposes and removed from the green belt, to enable the construction of a Diagnostic and Treatment Centre. This site, together with one in the Borough of Southend-on-Sea (Fossett's Farm) have been put out to public consultation, although no results are yet known.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a wide-ranging chapter that seeks to ensure that new and existing development are sustainable and that community and healthcare facilities are located appropriately. The local plan is not the vehicle to delivery such an assurance as is sought by the Essex Chambers of Trade and no alteration is recommended in the light of their representation. As the site selection process is incomplete with regard to a new healthcare facility it would seem prudent to gain further information before making a decision with regard to the Southend Hospital NHS Trust representation. The recommendation is therefore one requesting negotiation with the healthcare trust.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be left unaltered pending discussions between officers and the Southend Hospital NHS Trust or their planning representatives. Officers will report back to committee the results of such negotiations.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
10 – UTILITIES, HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES	UT6	Places of worship and community buildings
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
80 – GoEast – state that the policy addresses very general criteria that could be used to guide the location of a range of different land uses.		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
The comments made by the respondent are accepted and the policy should therefore be deleted and the supporting text amended. Proposals for places of worship and community buildings can be assessed against standard development control criteria.		
RECOMMENDATION		
That the policy be deleted:		
<p>POLICY UT6 – PLACES OF WORSHIP AND COMMUNITY BUILDINGS In considering proposals for community buildings or for the use of existing buildings for community purposes regard will be had for:</p> <p>i. The accessibility of sites to public transport; ii. The availability of suitable access and parking space; iii. The avoidance of undue disturbance affecting residential areas; and iv. Other policies in this plan.</p>		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
11 – POLLUTION	PN3	Protection of water quality
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>2 respondents supported this policy.</p> <p>191 – Ms G Yeadell – states that she must object to this because of the council's failure to implement such a policy in the past.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a new subject and chapter that recognises the issues and challenges of appropriate development, which have come forward since the adoption of the Rochford District Local Plan (First Review). Whilst supporting the aims of the policy the respondent uses the opportunity to discuss previous scheme. The comments are not relevant to the policy, which cannot be retrospective. It is therefore recommended that the policy be retained.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be retained:</p> <p>POLICY PN3 – PROTECTION OF WATER QUALITY Development affecting the water environment and associated lands will only be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The provision of water is not detrimental to existing abstractions, river flows, fisheries, amenity or nature conservation; and ii. It would not lead to an unacceptable deterioration in the quality or potential yield of coastal, surface and ground water resources. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
11 – POLLUTION	PN5	Noise generating development
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>1 respondent supported this policy.</p> <p>80 – Go East – state that the policy should be deleted and replaced by a broader, criteria based policy.</p> <p>191 – Ms G Yeadell – states that she must object to this because of the council's failure to implement such a policy in the past.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a new subject and chapter that recognises the issues and challenges of appropriate development, which have come forward since the adoption of the Rochford District Local Plan (First Review). GoEast wish to delete the policy and to have it included in a broader, criteria based policy. Such a policy would include a whole plethora of criteria, which could make the list difficult to use, implement or enforce. Whilst supporting the aims of the policy Ms Yeadell uses the opportunity to discuss previous scheme. The comments are not relevant to the policy, which cannot be retrospective. It is therefore recommended that the policy be retained.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be retained:</p> <p>POLICY PN5 – NOISE GENERATING DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>The District Council will expect noise generating development to be designed and operated in such a way that minimises the impact of noise nuisance on the environment.</p> <p>In considering proposals, the following will be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the proximity of existing or proposed noise sensitive developments; ii. the cumulative impact of noisy development; iii. the time and nature of the noise; and iv. the nature of the surrounding area. 		

CHAPTER	POLICY	TITLE
11 – POLLUTION	PN7	Light pollution
RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS		
<p>1 respondent supported this policy.</p> <p>80 – Go East – suggest the deletion of “the local planning authority will seek...” and also “...the local planning authority...” from the third sentence.</p> <p>137 – CPRESsex – state that the policy is rather vague and it needs to be cross-referenced to policy EB10. Suggests a new wording:</p> <p>“Proposals for external lighting which require planning permission will only be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the lighting is designed as an integral part of the development; - low energy lighting is used; - the alignment of lamps and provision of shielding minimises spillage and glow, including into the night sky; - the lighting intensity is no greater than that necessary to provide adequate illumination; - there is no significant loss of privacy and amenity to nearby residential properties and no danger to pedestrians and road users; and - there is no unacceptable harm to ecosystems.” <p>149 – Barling Magna Parish Council – aligns itself with the comments made by CPRESsex.</p> <p>150 – Sutton Parish Council – aligns itself with the comments made by CPRESsex.</p> <p>191 – Ms G Yeadell – states that supports the aim of the policy, but must object to this because of the council’s failure to implement such a policy in the past.</p>		
OFFICER'S COMMENTS		
<p>The policy forms part of a new subject and chapter that recognises the issues and challenges of appropriate development, which have come forwards since the adoption of the Rochford District Local Plan (First Review). GoEast suggest minor text amendments, which are acceptable. CPRESsex, Barling Magna and Sutton Parish Councils suggest a replacement policy parts of which could be included in the existing policy to strengthen it. Whilst supporting the aims of the policy Ms Yeadell uses the opportunity to discuss previous scheme. The comments are not relevant to the policy, which cannot be retrospective. It is therefore recommended that the policy be reworded.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION		
<p>That the policy be reworded, thus:</p> <p>POLICY PN7 - LIGHT POLLUTION</p> <p><u>The local planning authority will seek to minimise light pollution. 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 to the local planning authority 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 v will be refused:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Residential and commercial areas; ii. Areas of nature conservation interest; and iii. Areas whose open and remote landscape qualities would be affected; iv. <u>Highway safety; and</u> v. <u>The night sky.</u> 		