

APPENDIX A

The text shown in the following tables is amended using the following convention:

Original amendments	-	deletions <u>additions</u>
Following comments at the EO&SC meetings	-	deletions <u>additions</u>

ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 20th NOVEMBER 2003

527 REPORT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED TO THE ROCHFORD DISTRICT REPLACEMENT LOCAL PLAN

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services which dealt with representations received to the First Deposit Rochford District Replacement Local Plan in respect of Chapters 1, 6, 9, 10 and 11, a summary of which had been appended to the report, together with officer comments and a recommendation.

During Member debate, the following additional amendments were agreed, or re-wording requested:-

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy CS3 - the addition of a word to read "... to help protect the quality of the built and urban environment will generally be permitted".

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.~~ 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 generally be permitted.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy CS5 – a slight change of wording to read "Work with partners to consolidate"

CS5 - ENCOURAGING ECONOMIC REGENERATION

The local planning authority will:

- a. ~~Work with partners 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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy CS6 – Members were concerned that further guidance was needed, particularly around the provision of affordable housing, but noted that whilst there were a range of connected issues, some of which related to the Local Plan, others related to the broad policies of Housing Strategy, which were being addressed by the Housing Best Value Sub-Committee. Members noted that the design statements were identical to design principles and officers confirmed that the Member training programme could be used to provide examples of “designs of good quality”.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy LT1 – a slight change of wording to read “... rural landscape, biodiversity and the character ...”

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 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 ~~will be refused~~.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy LT2 – Members noted in response to their concerns that Policy LT23 had been strengthened to cover the issues around noise or disturbance.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy LT3 – Members were concerned that a proposal should not be refused simply because it did not meet all the criteria listed. Officers agreed to re-consider the wording contained in point (i).

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 to LPSPG10:

- The finished site should be level, free draining and of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed pitches;**
- It should be located where there is convenient access for the local communities;**
- The proposed pitches are for public use;**
- Vehicular access to the site from the highway can be accommodated without creating a highway hazard;**
- It should not have an adverse impact on residential amenity, nature conservation interests or the character of the countryside;**
- The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that provision has been made for the area's long term retention and maintenance.**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy LT5 – Members agreed to reword the supporting lower case text to say that the Council will look to all opportunities to enhance the park for the enjoyment of the public.

N.B. This was amended and referred back to the Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee at their meeting on 17th December 2003.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- LT8 – delete the words “where development is unavoidable”; delete the word “private” preceding “playing pitches”

POLICY LT8 – PUBLIC AND PRIVATE OPEN SPACE

~~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.~~

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- LT10 – Members agreed that whilst point (iii) should be the desired situation, proposals ought not to be rejected on this point alone and officers agreed to give further consideration to the wording.

POLICY LT10 – INDOOR SPORTS & LEISURE FACILITIES

Proposals for sports and recreation facilities will be permitted provided that the proposal meets the following criteria:

- Provides sufficient benefit to outweigh the loss of the existing land use;**
- Will allow satisfactory access to the site, provide adequate off-street parking and the adjoining roads are capable of taking any increase in traffic;**
- ~~Will~~ Should have nearby links to public transport;**
- Will have no adverse impact regarding noise disturbance on the locality;**
- Will have no adverse impact on the visual amenities of the area;**
- Will have regard to the existence of similar facilities with the locality; and**
- 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.**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- LT20 – amend the wording in paragraph 1 to read “.... conversion of existing building in the countryside to accommodate leisure”; amend the wording in paragraph (iii) to read “.... for the parking of guests’ vehicles within a farm complex, or on a plot” This policy has also been amended so that it ties in more closely with LT21.

POLICY LT20 – RURAL TOURISM

1. **The change of use and/or conversion of existing buildings in the countryside to ~~small-scale accommodation~~ for leisure or tourism related facilities (including hotels and guesthouses with less than 5 bedrooms) will be permitted, provided:**
 - 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~~ a farm complex, or on ~~the~~ 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
 - iv. A bat survey is undertaken.
2. Where planning permission for the re-use of rural buildings for tourist accommodation is permitted on a farm holding or plot, the local planning authority will impose a condition preventing the construction of additional buildings.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- LT21 – officers agreed to re-consider the wording to include, for example, bed and breakfast accommodation and to take account of the district-wide needs for hotel accommodation to support leisure and tourism.

POLICY LT21 - NEW HOTEL & GUESTHOUSE ACCOMMODATION

~~Proposals for new hotel accommodation will be considered favourably within the defined settlement boundaries of Rayleigh, Rochford and Rawreth.~~

- 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:**
 - 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.**

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:

- 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 character of the landscape;**
- 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.**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- LT22 – officers confirmed that a policy was not required for the ad hoc use of sites for a small number of caravans.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- UT4 – amend the final paragraph to read “These criteria will be applied having regard to the current capabilities faced by telecommunications operators and telecommunications development in the wider sense”.

POLICY UT4 – TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT

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:

- 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;**
- 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.**

These criteria will be applied having regard to the current capabilities ~~technical and operational constraints~~ faced by telecommunications operators and the benefits of telecommunications development in the wider sense.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- UT5 – Members noted that pending the decision by the Southend Hospital NHS Trust that the Cherry Orchard Brickworks site would not be their preferred site for the Diagnostic and Treatment Centre, and that the site would be retained in the Green Belt. This would not preclude the Council from deliberating on other uses for the site.

Recommended to the Environmental Services Committee

That, subject to the inclusion of the above recommendations, and agreement of updated recommendations on Policies LT3, LT10 and LT21, the response to representations received to the policies in Chapters 1, 6, 9, 10 and 11 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) be as outlined in the appendix to the report and the proposed changes be incorporated in the Second Deposit Draft of the Plan. (HPS)

ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
25th NOVEMBER 2003

**528 REPORT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED TO THE ROCHFORD DISTRICT
REPLACEMENT LOCAL PLAN**

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services summarising representations received to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan and the Council's proposed response to them.

During debate, the following additional amendments were agreed, or rewording requested:-

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy EB12 – a slight change of wording to read: “However, proposals that include expansion, intensification, or significant impacts on the Coastal Protection Zone, Metropolitan Green Belt, Special Landscape Area or other designated sites or increases in traffic impact will be refused”.

POLICY EB12 - 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 or other designated sites or increases in traffic impact will ~~are likely to~~ be refused. Development proposals, ~~other than limited infilling which are not~~ in line with PPG2 guidance and related to the main marine uses (defined as being mooring and maintenance) will ~~are likely to~~ be refused.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy TP6 – a slight change of wording to the title of this policy, to read: “Safeguarding and the Promotion of Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Routes”.

POLICY TP6 – SAFEGUARDING & THE PROMOTION OF WALKING, AND CYCLING AND HORSERIDING ROUTES

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.

Cycling and walking will be promoted as an alternative to using the car especially for shorter distance trips. Development must ensure the by:-

- The Provision of a safe and convenient network of cycle and pedestrian routes linking homes, workplaces, community facilities and transport interchanges and also the provision of secure cycle parking at centres of attraction;**

- ii. ~~Use ing of~~ traffic management measures to improve conditions for pedestrians, the mobility impaired and cyclists;
- iii. ~~Provision in Ensuring that~~ new development and transport schemes ~~make appropriate~~ provision for pedestrians, the mobility impaired and cyclists;
- iv. ~~Encouraging passenger transport companies to accommodate cycles on trains and buses and encouraging the p~~ Provision of good access and secure cycle parking facilities at public transport interchanges.

The local planning authority will work with the highway authority to ensure appropriate opportunities are provided throughout the plan period.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy TP11 – Mindful that Government policy stipulates that car parking standards should be maximums, Members nevertheless considered that the Authority should have more autonomy. The words “as a general rule” should therefore be inserted after “In considering applications for new development, the Council will expect...”.

POLICY TP11 - CAR PARKING STANDARDS

In considering applications for new development the Council will as a general rule, expect the provision of car parking spaces in accordance with the 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. The standards are maximums unless otherwise stated.

[TEXT BOX REMAINS UNCHANGED]

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy BC1 – remove the words “endeavour to” in the first sentence.

POLICY BC1 - CONSERVATION AREAS: GENERAL

The Local Planning Authority will ~~endeavour to~~ 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.

Applications for new buildings, extensions and alterations within, or adjacent to, Conservation Areas, will be permitted provided that the following design criteria are met:-

- 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 existing building would be expected to complement ~~are retained and faithfully replicated in the existing new~~ 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.

Guidance to be used for the assessment of proposals against the above criteria is to be found in LPSPG7.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- Policy BC2 – remove the word “or” at the end of i (a).

POLICY BC2 – DEMOLITION WITHIN CONSERVATION AREAS

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:

- 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

The local planning authority will require the signing of a legal agreement before permission to demolish is granted requiring the redevelopment of the site within an agreed timeframe.

Recommended to the Environmental Services Committee

That, subject to the inclusion of the above recommended amendments, the response to representations received to the policies in Chapters 4, 5, 7 and 12 of the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) be as outlined in the appendix to the report and that the proposed changes be incorporated in the Second Deposit Draft of the Plan. (HPS)

**ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
17TH DECEMBER 2003**

**594 REPORT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED FOR THE ROCHFORD
DISTRICT REPLACEMENT LOCAL PLAN**

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services which summarised the representations received to the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan and set out proposed responses to them.

Members reviewed the report on a page by page basis. Responding to questions, officers advised as follows:-

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

Rural Exceptions (HP10)

- “The Protection of Biodiversity Interests on and surrounding the site” could be inserted as v under Policy HP10.

POLICY HP10 – RURAL EXCEPTIONS

The LPA will consider proposals for the provision of affordable housing in rural areas subject to:

- It being demonstrated that there is an identified local need;**
- It not being possible to satisfy these needs in any other way;**
- There being access to local services; ~~and~~**
- The housing being legally available for local people in perpetuity; and**
- The protection of biodiversity interests on and surrounding the site.**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

Flatted Accommodation (HP12)

- Reference to the soundproofing of flats could be included in the lowercase text.

INSERT NEW PARAGRAPH 2.45

“Although the internal layout and design of flatted accommodation is primarily a matter for developers and Building Control, the Council believes that high quality flatted accommodation is desirable and that such development must pay adequate regard to issues such as soundproofing.”

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

Sub-division of Dwellings (HP17)

- Reference to soundproofing could be included in the lowercase text.

INSERT NEW PARAGRAPH 2.55

“Although the internal layout and design of subdivided dwellings will be fundamentally affected by the existing design of the buildings, the Council believes that high quality

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

residential accommodation is desirable and that such development must pay adequate regard to issues such as soundproofing.”

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

Special Landscape Areas (NR1)

- The recommendation would be adjusted to reflect officer comments within the report.

POLICY NR1 – SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS

Within the three Special Landscape Areas identified on the proposals map, ~~in addition to any other policies set out elsewhere in this written statement,~~ 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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

Sites of Special Scientific Interest (NR7)

- The officer’s recommendation should read ‘deleted’, rather than ‘amended’.

“It is recommended that the policy is ~~amended~~ deleted, thus:

~~POLICY NR7 – SITES OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST~~

~~Proposals for development which would have an adverse affect, either directly or indirectly, on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) will not be permitted unless the justification for the development clearly outweighs the national nature conservation importance of the site.~~

~~If there is a risk of damage to a designated site from development the Local Planning Authority will endeavour to enter into a planning obligation with developers to secure future site management or to make compensatory provision elsewhere for any losses expected when development occurs.”~~

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

Table 2.1 (URBAN CAPACITY HOUSING PROVISION TO 2011)

- The urban capacity housing provision table would be adjusted to reflect any changes in residential allocation.

TABLE 2.1 URBAN CAPACITY HOUSING PROVISION TO 2011	
Housing category	No. of units
Intensification	250
Sub-division	50
Other sites (See Note a)	394 <u>326</u>
LOTS	12
Rural	62
Total	765 <u>700</u>
Note a: The 'other' sites listed in Table 2.1 include sites allocated for residential development in Policy HP2.	

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

Table 2.2 (SUMMARY OF HOUSING PROVISION 1996 – 2011)

- The urban capacity housing provision table would be adjusted to reflect any changes in residential allocation.

TABLE 2.2 SUMMARY OF HOUSING PROVISION 1996 – 2011	
Housing Provision	No. of units (net)
Completions 1996 – 2001	1830
All sites with planning permission (2001 and availability statement)	620
All sites without planning permission (2001 and availability statement)	129
Urban capacity study sites in addition to land availability statement sites expected to be developed in plan period.	765 <u>700</u>
TOTAL	3344 <u>3279</u>
Structure Plan Provision (Policy H1)	3050

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

Creation of Intertidal Habitats (8.55 & 8.58)

- The term "retreat" should be replaced with "managed realignment".

[8.55] It is recommended that the paragraph be amended, thus:

“The Environment Agency, who have a regulatory and supervisory duty for flood defence matters recognise that there are sea walls where ~~retreat~~ managed realignment schemes could be a possibility as shown in their report Essex Sea Wall Management (1998).”

[8.58] It is recommended that the paragraph be amended, thus:

“The ~~retreat~~ 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).”

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

Education (10.37)

- The term "will" could be replaced with the term "may" in the penultimate sentence of the recommendation.

That the paragraph be amended:

“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.”

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

POLICY HP2 – HOUSING SITE ALLOCATION

- With regard to housing allocation at the Stambridge Mills site, the Committee agreed a motion, moved by Councillor K H Hudson and seconded by T E Goodwin, that the proposed designation for residential development should be removed in favour of a B1 allocation (offices or light industrial).

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	<u>Park School, Rawreth Lane, Rayleigh</u> <u>(see note a)</u>	120
iv	Playing Fields, Rochford County Primary School. Ashingdon Road, Rochford (see note b)	25
v	Main Road, Hawkwell (see note c)	36
vi	Stambridge Mills, Rochford (see note d)	65

- 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.*
- 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.*
- 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.*
- ~~*The development of the site for housing will be dependent on suitable flood protection being provided.*~~

The Committee also agreed the following:-

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- That the term "ecological" should follow "landscape" under HP3i (moved by Councillor P F A Webster and seconded by Councillor T G Cutmore).

HP3 – DENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT

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 ~~must fall within the range 30-50 dwellings per hectare (net) in most circumstances.~~ The character of individual sites and surroundings ~~and the efficient use of land~~ will determine the acceptable density ~~for a site within this range,~~ 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, the local planning authority will take into account:

- 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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- That reference to biodiversity and nature conservation interests should be included in policy HP4 (moved by Councillor P F A Webster and seconded by Councillor C I Black).

It is recommended that the policy be amended as follows:

POLICY HP4 – DESIGN STATEMENTS

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. ~~the substance of which must be agreed with the authority in advance of the submission of a 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.

~~Development should then be in accordance with the broad principles of the approved design statement.~~

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION & REVISION

- That the term "and phasing" should follow the term "provision" under policy HP6 (moved by Councillor C I Black and seconded by Councillor P F A Webster).
- That the term "ensure" should be retained in the third line of policy HP6 (moved by Councillor C I Black and seconded by Councillor T G Cutmore).

It is recommended that Policy HP6 be amended as follows:

POLICY HP6 - INFRASTRUCTURE

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 ~~seek ensure~~ 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.

Recommended to the Environmental Services Committee:-

That, subject to inclusion of the above adjustments, the response to representations received to the policies in Chapters 2, 3 and 8, all paragraphs, proposals, maps and new policies and paragraphs for the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan (First Deposit Draft) be as outlined in the appendix to the report of the Head of Planning Services and that the proposed changes be incorporated in the Second Deposit Draft of the Plan. (HPS)

NEW ADDITIONAL POLICY & TEXT RELATING TO STAMBRIDGE MILLS

Members will note the alterations to the tables dealing with Urban Capacity and Housing Allocations made because of the recommendation to change the proposed allocation for Stambridge Mill from residential to B1 (Business). No policy was included in the employment chapter to cover such a use for the site. The following policy and supporting text is recommended for inclusion.

[TO FOLLOW POLICY EB12]

"STAMBRIDGE MILLS"

Stambridge Mills is a disused milling complex on the north bank of the River Crouch. The main route to and from the site involves transit through Rochford Town Centre. It is therefore not a suitable location for a B8 (storage and distribution) use, as defined by the Use Classes Order 1987. The purpose built buildings and location within a flood risk area pose significant constraints on the site for uses other than milling. It is unlikely that the existing buildings could be suitably or adequately converted for other uses.

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.

The following policy will apply to the Stambridge Mills site, as defined on the proposals maps:

POLICY EB13 – STAMBRIDGE MILLS

Development at Stambridge Mills will be restricted to class B1 (light industrial) 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.

Applications for demolition will not be granted unless accompanied by an acceptable redevelopment scheme.

COMMENTS SUBSEQUENT TO THE ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Members should also note that Carpenter Planning Consultants do not believe that their representations received regarding paragraphs 2.10-2.19 and 2.21-2.27 and tables 2.1 & 2.2 were covered by the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Officers have considered the representations made which relate to:

1. 2.10-2.15 and tables 2.1 and 2.2 refer to the fact that the Urban Capacity Study produced on behalf of the Council is flawed.
2. 2.16 & 2.17 refer to the fact that the density of development has been restricted contrary to advice in PPG3.
3. 2.18 & 2.19 refer to design statements and the respondent believes that the approach is unnecessarily prescriptive.
4. 2.21 refers to planning obligations and the fact that the policy not specific enough and that it may not be implementable.
5. 2.22-2.27 refer to design and layout, which the respondent believes is incorrect with regard to minimum garden areas and that newer standards than the *Essex Design Guide* should be imposed.

It is recommended that these aspects of the chapter have already been dealt with through the Local Plan representations process and that no further amendments are necessary or desirable.