

CHAPTER 4 - EMPLOYMENT

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|------------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB1 | General Strategy |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| 80 – GoEast – state that the policy reads as statement of intent and so should be made an objective rather than a policy. | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| The employment chapter is one of the key front-end chapters that need to be implemented effectively for the plan to be successful. The respondent's comment is valid and it is recommended that the policy be deleted. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| It is recommended that the policy is deleted and consigned to boxed text following 4.14. | | |
| <p>POLICY EB1 – GENERAL STRATEGY The Council will seek to maintain and increase appropriate levels of employment and economic activity in the District commensurate with environmental considerations and the capacity of the infrastructure. This will be achieved by the other provisions of the Local Plan and the activities of other relevant agencies and when considered necessary ad hoc initiatives by the Council related to the resources that may be available from time to time.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|---------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB2 | Provision Mix |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>14 – Lansbury Holdings Ltd – state that the policy should specifically seek to provide strategic employment opportunities within the district as well as small business units. Suggest additional text as follows: “The Council will also seek to preserve the opportunity for existing companies wishing to relocate to larger premises and strategic inward investment by specifically identifying land for such purposes.”</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the policy reads as statement of intent and so should be made an objective rather than a policy.</p> <p>121 – BT plc – state that the Great Wakering ATE site is allocated for employment use although it is not currently used as such being utilities equipment and there is no direct employment on the site.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The employment chapter is one of the key front-end chapters that need to be implemented effectively for the plan to be successful. Go-East's comment is valid and it is recommended that the policy be deleted. The comment made by BT plc is not so valid as the land makes up part of the area within the industrial estate and would be suitable for a concordant use were the utility use to cease. The comments made by Lansbury Holdings Ltd are valid, but the Council's Economic Development Officer has stated that there is a greater need for starter units than for larger units for expanding companies. Existing allocations can accommodate larger premises in any event. It is therefore recommended that the policy be deleted and placed in the supporting text, together with the text suggested by Lansbury Holdings Ltd.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be deleted:</p> <p>POLICY EB2 – PROVISION MIX The Council will give special consideration to the needs and encouragement of small businesses and will seek to ensure that an adequate and appropriate mix of units, including starter units, are provided by new development proposals.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|----------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB3 | Existing sites |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>80 – GoEast – state that the reference to employment uses requires further explanation as such a general term can encompass a range of different types with different land use implications. The final sentence is superfluous and this policy should be combined with EB4.</p> <p>81 – Southend-on-Sea Borough Council – state that the policy does not follow policy BIW4 of the Replacement Structure Plan, as there is no clear safeguarding requirement.</p> <p>133 – House Builders Federation – state that there is a need for the LPA to reassess whether too much employment land has been allocated so that some may be re-allocated for residential purposes if appropriate, as per guidance within PPG3.</p> <p>163 – B&Q plc – state that the final sentence is too restrictive and should be deleted. There should be greater flexibility and the acceptance of alternative uses when employment uses are not forthcoming.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The employment chapter is one of the key front-end chapters that need to be implemented effectively for the plan to be successful. Go-East's comment is valid and it is recommended that the policy be merged with EB4 and that the final sentence be deleted. The comments made by other respondents have been taken on board.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be merged with EB4 and its final sentence deleted.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|-------------------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB4 | Allocation of new sites |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>47 – AH Philpot & Sons Ltd and B Coker Esq – state that land west of Shotgate Farm should be included in table 4.2 and thus this would affect the hectarage available. Their representation has indirect effect on Policy EB4.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the reference to employment uses requires further explanation as such a general term can encompass a range of different types with different land use implications. The final sentence is superfluous and this policy should be combined with EB4.</p> <p>121 – BT plc – state that the Great Wakering ATE site is allocated for employment use although it is not currently used as such being utilities equipment and there is no direct employment on the site.</p> <p>133 – House Builders Federation – state that there is a need for the LPA to reassess whether too much employment land has been allocated so that some may be re-allocated for residential purposes if appropriate, as per guidance within PPG3.</p> <p>136 – Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce – state that the residential allocation at Stambridge Mills is inappropriate and the site should be retained as an employment site.</p> <p>162 – Mr Roger Phipps – states that land at Michelin Farm (at the junction of the A127 and former A130) should be removed from the green belt and allocated for employment purposes. It must therefore be included in the list at 4.12.</p> <p>163 – B&Q plc – state that the final sentence is too restrictive and should be deleted. There should be greater flexibility and the acceptance of alternative uses when employment uses are not forthcoming.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>Go-East's comment is accepted and it is recommended that the policy be merged with EB3 and that the final sentence be deleted.</p> <p>The comment made by BT plc is not so valid as the land makes up part of the area within the industrial estate and would be suitable for a concordant use where the utility use to cease. It is recommended that the policy be merged with EB3 and minor text amendment be made.</p> <p>Objections relating to the release of additional land for employment related purposes are not accepted: the allocations within the Local Plan fulfil the requirements of the Structure Plan.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be merged with EB3 and its final sentence deleted:</p> <p>POLICY EB3 - EXISTING SITES & THE ALLOCATION OF NEW SITES Within those areas <u>proposed for use or currently used</u> primarily for employment purposes as shown in table 4.2 and on the proposals maps, applications for development within classes B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage) of the Use Classes Order (1987) will be permitted, providing that the criteria in EB5 are met. The Council will also discourage any proposed retail uses within such development proposals.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|-------------------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB4 | Allocation of new sites |
| <p>POLICY EB4 - ALLOCATION OF NEW SITES Within these new areas allocated primarily for employment purposes as shown in table 4.2 and on the proposals maps, applications for development within classes B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage) of the Use Classes Order (1987) will be permitted, providing that the criteria laid out in policy EB5 are met. The Council will also discourage any proposed retail uses within such development proposals.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|--------------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB5 | Criteria for sites |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| 32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – suggest amended text to be criterion viii: “The ecological value of the site and adjoining land” 42 – English Nature – suggest amended text to be criterion i: “the necessity to protect and enhance nature conservation interests on the land” | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| The employment chapter is one of the key front-end chapters that need to be implemented effectively for the plan to be successful. The comments made by the respondents are similar and are recommended for incorporation into the policy. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| It is recommended that the policy have an extra criterion added, thus: POLICY EB5 - CRITERIA FOR SITES In considering applications to use or develop land for employment purposes, regard will be had to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The impact of development on the Metropolitan Green Belt and other designated sites; ii. <u>The ecological value of the site and adjoining land;</u> iii. The availability of land or buildings available for employment; iv. The implications of traffic generation; v. The balance of non-industrial uses; vi. Evidence of demand for the particular type of development proposed; vii. The suitability of the area for the proposed use more generally; and viii. Any other benefits offered by the scheme. | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|--------------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB6 | Criteria for sites |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – suggest the addition of the following text to the last paragraph of the policy: “...site, access, layout, <u>the ecological value of the site and adjoining land.</u>”</p> <p>42 – English Nature – suggest the addition of the following text to the last paragraph of the policy: “...site, access, layout <u>and protect and enhance nature conservation interests.</u>”</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state this policy is not necessary as it duplicates national policy in PPG6.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The response from GoEast is duly noted and accepted. The representations made by the other respondents are similar and are recommended for incorporation into the policy.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be altered, thus:</p> <p>POLICY EB6 - MAKING THE BEST USE OF AVAILABLE LAND In determining proposals for development for business, industry and warehousing on sites which are not allocated on the proposals maps, <u>thea sequential test contained within PPG6</u> will be applied, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Town centres for major office development; 2. Re-use of previously developed land within urban areas; 3. Re-use of other land in inner urban and suburban areas; and 4. Planned peripheral development. <p>In applying this test the local planning authority will consider how the development will improve its surroundings, the appearance of buildings, screening, any harmful impacts on neighbouring uses, site access, <u>and layout and the ecological value of the site and adjacent land.</u></p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|---------------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB7 | Non-conforming uses |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| 80 – GoEast - state that the policy reads as statement of intent and so should be made an objective rather than a policy. | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| The response from GoEast is not acceptable, as this policy is the continuation of successful and effective policy carried forward from the Rochford District Local Plan (First Review). Their comments are therefore rejected and it recommended to retain the policy. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| It is recommended that the policy be retained, thus: | | |
| POLICY EB7 - NON-CONFORMING USES Where existing employment development inhibits the development of land for an allocated purpose, or has a serious adverse effect on residential or rural amenities, the council WILL consider using its powers, including compulsory purchase powers, to secure its relocation or extinguishment. | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|-------------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB8 | Working from home |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| 194 – Canewdon Parish Council – state that the policy should be amended to be more negative and that it should be much more prescriptive, specifying the types of use that will be acceptable | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| The response from Canewdon Parish Council is not accepted. The policy has been drawn up using advice from the Council's Planning Enforcement Team, who are happy with the wording. To alter the wording of the policy to a more negative stance would be contrary to government guidance and to have a list of suitable uses would not be robust or defensible on appeal. It is therefore recommended to retain the policy in its current form. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| It is recommended that the policy be retained, thus: | | |
| <p>POLICY EB8 - WORKING FROM HOME Proposals for business uses (class B1 uses as defined by the <i>Use Classes Order 1987</i>, or any legislation replacing this Order) operating from dwellings, which require planning permission, will be permitted provided that all the following criteria are met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The use remains linked to the residential use, such that it does not become a separate commercial unit; 2. It will not have a significant adverse effect on residential amenity; 3. It will not have a detrimental effect upon the visual character of the surrounding residential area; and 4. It will not create on street parking or unacceptable highway problems. <p>Where such uses are approved they will be subject to appropriate conditions, for instance controlling the size and frequencies of delivery vehicles, times of deliveries, visits, etc. as well as a condition or S.106 legal agreement relating the use solely to the person who occupies the dwelling and undertakes the activity.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|-------------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB9 | Design Statements |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>1 respondent supported this policy.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – suggest additional text to be associated with the policy, thus: “Policy EB5 provides the policy framework for the preparation of design statements, but further guidance on the matters to be included is provided in LPSPG5 and all design statements should address the principles of CS6, where relevant.”</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The response from English Nature is noted and accepted. It is therefore recommended to amend the policy.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY EB9 - DESIGN STATEMENTS A design statement must accompany proposals for all major employment development (over 1000m² of floor space and / or a site area 1 hectare). On smaller, but complex or sensitive sites, as defined by the local planning authority, a design statement will also be requested. Such a statement should include an analysis and evaluation of the site and its context, design principles and a design solution. <u>Further guidance on the matters to be included is provided in LPSPG5 and all design statements should address the principles of CS6.</u></p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|-------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB10 | Landscaping |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>1 respondent supported this policy.</p> <p>32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – suggests an amendment to the final paragraph of the policy by inserting “ecological value” after “amenities” and the deletion of “...the seclusion of...”</p> <p>42 – English Nature – suggest an addition to the policy, thus: “Proposals for the long-term management and maintenance of landscaping proposals must also be included, which will also be subject to conditions. <u>Both the design and management of landscaping schemes should identify, protect and enhance nature conservation interests on-site and in surrounding areas.</u>”</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the policy reads as statement of intent and so should be made an objective rather than a policy.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>Go-East's comment is not accepted and given the general support for the policy it is recommended that the comments made by the Essex Wildlife Trust and English Nature be taken board and the text amended accordingly.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY EB10 - LANDSCAPING</p> <p>The local planning authority will require that landscaping proposals form an integral part of any proposal for employment development or design statement. The local planning authority will seek additional landscaping measures including improvements to existing features to reduce the impact of development on established sites and their settings. The Council will have particular regard to the impact of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting, including that for security purposes; • Hard and soft landscaping measures; and • Buffer zones <p>Special attention must be paid to on site earth mounding or planting to protect and enhance the amenities, <u>ecological value</u> and appearance of the surroundings in general, and of neighbouring properties or the seclusion of nature conservation sites in particular. Proposals for the long-term management and maintenance of landscaping proposals must also be included, which will be subject to conditions. <u>Both the design and management of landscaping schemes should identify, protect and enhance nature conservation interests on-site and in surrounding areas.</u></p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|--------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB11 | Baltic Wharf |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>1 respondent supported this policy.</p> <p>32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – state that there should be reference to the statutory nature conservation designations in the list of constraints.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – suggest an addition to the policy, thus: <u>“...their own merits and shall ensure the protection and, where possible, the enhancement of nature conservation interests in the area.”</u></p> <p>61 – Environment Agency – state that development at this site should be related to river uses only. Any applications should be accompanied by a full flood risk assessment, including flood mitigation measures, flood proofing and evacuation warnings / procedures.</p> <p>73 – RSPB – state the significant impacts of development here should be mentioned as they would affect the Special Protection Area, which should be mentioned in the policy.</p> <p>100 – James Industrial Ltd – state that the policy should be amended to allow for partial or complete redevelopment and / or a policy should be introduced in the Rural Issues chapter to fully reflect government guidance in PPG2.</p> <p>109 – Baltic Distribution Ltd – state the policy is too negative and unduly restrictive; failing to recognise the sustainability and economic benefits that could occur from the development of the port facility within its existing boundaries. The policy should therefore be reworded.</p> <p>136 – Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce – state the industrial areas listed in paragraph 4.12 should not be considered exhaustive. In any event Baltic Wharf should be added to this list, which would appear consistent with the supporting text to this policy.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The responses from environmental organisations are duly noted and accepted, except those by English Nature. This is because other legislation is best placed to deal with this. Some strengthening of the policy will occur by making reference to the nature conservation designations affecting this area. With regard to the representation from Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce, this is also taken board and paragraph 4.12 will be altered accordingly. In response to the representations from James Industrial Ltd and Baltic Distribution Ltd, it is not considered that the policy is unduly restrictive or negative. However, it is recognised that the policy can be improved by amending the wording to bring further clarity. It is therefore recommended that the policy be amended.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY EB11 - BALTIC WHARF Applications for the further development of this site will be considered on their own merits. However, proposals that include expansion, intensification, or significant impacts on the Coastal Protection Zone, Metropolitan Green Belt, Special Landscape Area <u>or other designated sites</u> or increases in traffic impact will be refused. Development proposals, other than infilling which are not in line with PPG2 guidance, for storage and wharfage will also be refused.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|--------------|
| 4 – EMPLOYMENT | EB12 | Essex Marina |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>1 respondent supported this policy.</p> <p>32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – state that there should be reference to the statutory nature conservation designations in the list of constraints.</p> <p>42 – English Nature – suggest an addition to the policy, thus: <u>“...their own merits and shall ensure the protection and, where possible, the enhancement of nature conservation interests in the area.”</u></p> <p>61 – Environment Agency – state that development at this site should be related to river uses only. Any applications should be accompanied by a full flood risk assessment, including flood mitigation measures, flood proofing and evacuation warnings / procedures.</p> <p>73 – RSPB – state the significant impacts of development here should be mentioned as they would affect the Special Protection Area, which should be mentioned in the policy.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The responses from nature conservation organisations are duly noted and accepted. Some strengthening of the policy will occur by making reference to the international designations affecting this area. However, it is recognised that the policy can be improved by amending the wording to bring further clarity. It is therefore recommended that the policy be amended.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>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 <u>or other designated sites</u> or increases in traffic impact are likely to be refused. Development proposals, other than limited infilling <u>which are not</u> in line with PPG2 guidance and related to the main marine uses (defined as being mooring and maintenance) <u>will</u> are likely to be refused.</p> | | |

CHAPTER 5 - TRANSPORT

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|-----------------------|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP1 | Sustainable transport |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>61 – Environment Agency – state that there should be mention of <i>Green Transport Plans</i>. 80 – GoEast – state that the policy reads as statement of intent and so should be made an objective rather than a policy.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The Transport chapter represented a change in approach from the adopted Rochford District Local Plan (First Review), which was largely scheme based. The new chapter is intended to be theme based, centred on the objectives stated in Chapter 1. With regard to the response by GoEast, the policy may be seen as a statement of intent. However, it is intended to be read as a guiding principle for development. Its general terms enable it to cover a variety development types. The policy is also central to the chapter as it sets out the approach to be taken with regard to sustainable transport. With regard to the response by the Environment Agency, there is no basis for this approach in law or in government planning guidance. The representations are therefore rejected and it is recommended that the policy be retained.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be retained, thus:</p> <p>POLICY TP1 - SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT The local planning authority will develop and implement a sustainable approach to transport planning based on managing the demand for travel and distribution, which is integrated with land use planning, and which aims to:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce the need to travel; 2. Reduce the growth in the length, duration and number of motorised journeys; 3. Encourage alternative means of travel which have less environmental impact; and 4. Reduce reliance on the private car and road haulage. | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|--------------------|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP2 | Traffic management |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>80 – GoEast – state that the policy reads as statement of intent and so should be made an objective rather than a policy. The use of the phrase “In appropriate circumstances...” should be avoided.</p> <p>145 – Rayleigh Civic Society – state they would like to see a specific reference to the traffic problems of Rayleigh Town Centre, as they believe the situation is worsening and attention is required by the District Council and County Council.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The Transport chapter represented a change in approach from the adopted Rochford District Local Plan (First Review), which was largely scheme based. The new chapter is intended to be theme based, centred on the objectives stated in Chapter 1. With regard to the response by GoEast, the policy may be seen as a statement of intent. However, it is intended to be read as a guiding principle for development and an alteration to the text to clarify this is recommended. With regard to the response by Rayleigh Civic Society, it would be inappropriate to make mention of any perceived problems in Rayleigh within this policy and no alteration is recommended in response to this policy. It is recommended that the policy be amended.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY TP2 - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT <u>In development proposals</u> In appropriate circumstances, traffic management measures will be used <u>required</u> throughout the district to:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the environment within historic areas, town centres, other shopping centres, residential areas, villages and rural areas; 2. Improve road safety; 3. Improve the capacity of existing roads; 4. Improve conditions for passenger transport, cyclists, pedestrians, the mobility impaired and horse riders; and 5. Manage traffic demand. | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|-----------------|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP3 | Traffic calming |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| 80 – GoEast – state that the policy needs to have specific examples of where measures will be required. At the moment the policy provides no clarity as it assumes that all development will be required to incorporate traffic calming. | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| The Transport chapter represented a change in approach from the adopted Rochford District Local Plan (First Review), which was largely scheme based. The new chapter is intended to be theme based, centred on the objectives stated in Chapter 1. The respondent's comment is correct, but rather than trying to specify an exhaustive list of schemes where traffic calming will be required, it is considered more appropriate to include general development types. In any event, the policy is designed to be applied to all developments where there is a significant traffic impact. It is therefore recommended that the policy be amended. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus: | | |
| POLICY TP3 - TRAFFIC CALMING <u>New housing, leisure, retail or other employment related development creating significant traffic impacts</u> will not be permitted unless the road layout <u>highway design</u> is appropriate to the locality and incorporates measures to achieve safe traffic speeds and secure a pleasant and safe environment. | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|--------------------|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP4 | Heavy Lorry Routes |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>136 – Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce – state that the policy contradicts Transport Objective T4. They also state that the policy will jeopardise farm diversification projects and inward investment. The policy is not clear with regard to whether the Council would permit development close to 'preferred routes' outside existing or proposed industrial estates.</p> <p>140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – state that this is a narrow minded policy which inhibits inward investment and new job creation.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The Transport chapter represented a change in approach from the adopted Rochford District Local Plan (First Review), which was largely scheme based. The new chapter is intended to be theme based, centred on the objectives stated in Chapter 1. It would appear that the two respondents have significant concerns regarding the effect of this policy on farm diversification and inward investment. The policy is not intended to prevent this. However, such developments can affect highway safety and lead to an increase of goods vehicles on the roads. No development should be permitted that creates significant adverse impacts – often referred to as demonstrable harm – as this would be contrary to government guidance and statute. It is recommended that the policy be amended to clarify the intent of the policy and to alleviate the concerns of the respondents.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY TP4 - HEAVY LORRY ROUTES</p> <p>The Council will refuse applications for development likely to <u>create significant adverse traffic impacts, including</u> generate heavy vehicle movements, that are on sites outside existing or proposed industrial estates or that would give rise to <u>other</u> adverse environmental impacts.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|------------------|
| 5 – TRANSPORT | TP5 | Public Transport |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>1 respondent supported this policy.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the policy reads as statement of intent and should be included in a Local Transport Plan, rather than as a policy.</p> <p>140 – Essex Chambers of Commerce – state that this policy does not adequately support rural communities. They go on to say that Essex County Council should significantly increase their support for rural bus services to improve the frequency of services.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The Transport chapter represented a change in approach from the adopted Rochford District Local Plan (First Review), which was largely scheme based. The new chapter is intended to be theme based, centred on the objectives stated in Chapter 1. It is recommended to agree with the response from GoEast, that the policy is perhaps too aspirational and that a more appropriately worded policy should replace it. It is also agreed that the first part of the response from the Essex Chambers of Commerce can be incorporated. However, the second part of their response is not appropriate for inclusion within the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be replaced, thus:</p> <p>POLICY TP5 - PUBLIC TRANSPORT</p> <p>In consultation with Essex County Council, the transport agencies and operators, a safe, reliable and convenient network of passenger transport services will be promoted to meet the reasonable needs of the community and to provide an attractive alternative to car usage particularly for travel to, and within, urban areas. Particular priorities will include:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Measures to improve the attractiveness of passenger transport services including schemes for bus priority, appropriate park and ride (both road and rail), improvements to passenger transport co-ordination and interchanges, and the development of improved facilities and services for passengers, including quality bus partnerships; 2. Improvements to the existing rail network including track infrastructure and passenger facilities at railway stations, and where appropriate the development of improved services, new routes and railway stations. Active support will be given to proposed improvements to the rail network that will help reduce demand for travel by car or lorry within the district; 3. The identification, in conjunction with Essex County Council, of an appropriate level of bus and rail service provision; such services will be promoted in conjunction with transport operators through a range of financial measures; 4. The promotion of transport mode integration through such measures as improved interchanges, integration of services, through-ticketing and comprehensive travel information. 5. Where former or potential public transport corridors or sites are identified as part of a sustainable transport strategy, the local planning authority will protect these from development that would prejudice that transport role, through the planning process. | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|------------------|
| 5 – TRANSPORT | TP5 | Public Transport |
| <p><u>Development must be well related to existing public transport infrastructure, particularly in rural areas. Where such developments are not well located to such infrastructure, then contributions towards the provision of public transport and alternatives to private car use will be sought. Development that fails to promote sustainable transport choices will be refused.</u></p> <p><u>Where former or potential public transport corridors or sites are identified as part of a sustainable transport strategy, the local planning authority will protect these from development that would prejudice that transport role, through the planning process.</u></p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|-------------------|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP6 | Walking & cycling |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>2 respondents supported this policy.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state that the policy reads as statement of intent and only criterion 3 gives any indication of what is sought by the local planning authority. The policy should therefore be reworded to set out what the Council is seeking.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The Transport chapter represented a change in approach from the adopted Rochford District Local Plan (First Review), which was largely scheme based. The new chapter is intended to be theme based, centred on the objectives stated in Chapter 1. The response made by GoEast is acceptable that the policy is too aspirational. It is recommended that it be amended to remain the thrust of the original policy, but to ensure that the policy is capable of effective and successful implementation.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended, including additional text taken from policy TP8, thus:</p> <p>POLICY TP6 – <u>SAFEGUARDING & THE PROMOTION OF WALKING AND CYCLING ROUTES</u></p> <p><u>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.</u></p> <p>Cycling and walking will be promoted as an alternative to using the car especially for shorter distance trips. <u>Development must ensure the by:-</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. 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;</u> <u>2. Use ing of</u> traffic management measures to improve conditions for pedestrians, the mobility impaired and cyclists; <u>3. Provision in</u> Ensuring that new development and transport schemes make appropriate provision for pedestrians, the mobility impaired and cyclists; <u>4. Encouraging passenger transport companies to accommodate cycles on trains and buses and encouraging the p</u>Provision of good access and secure cycle parking facilities at public transport interchanges. <p><u>The local planning authority will work with the highway authority to ensure appropriate opportunities are provided throughout the plan period.</u></p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|---------------------------|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP7 | Provision for horseriding |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>80 – GoEast – state that the policy reads as statement of intent and therefore should be deleted.</p> <p>148 – Ashingdon Parish Council – state that the sooner action is taken to implement this policy, the better for all concerned.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>No response is necessary with regard to the comments from Ashingdon Parish Council. With regard to the response from GoEast, it is recommended that the policy be deleted and placed as supporting text in the chapter and included in the next revision of the Local Transport Plan.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be deleted:</p> <p>POLICY TP7 – PROVISION FOR HORSERIDING The Council will promote the creation of new bridle paths in the district in order to form a comprehensive network of routes segregated from traffic in the interests of rider safety.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|---|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP8 | Safeguarding of cycling, walking and horseriding routes |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| 80 – GoEast – state that the policy should be combined with TP6 and therefore should be deleted. | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| It is recommended that the policy be deleted and that text should be added to policy TP6. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| It is recommended that the policy be deleted and that it be combined with policy TP6. | | |
| <p>POLICY TP8 – SAFEGUARDING OF CYCLING, WALKING AND HORSERIDING ROUTES</p> <p>Planning permission will not be granted for development affecting existing cycling, walking and horseriding routes unless the proposals include either the maintenance or diversion of the route, to one which is no less attractive, safe and convenient for public use.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|--|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP9 | Access for people with impaired mobility |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| 133 – House Builders Federation – state that access to public buildings is a matter for building regulations. As the Local Plan should not duplicate other legal regimes, the policy should be deleted. | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| The representation is not considered valid. The aim of the policy is to take further minimum requirements in order to ensure the suitable design of new developments, a key objective of the plan. It is therefore recommended that the policy be retained. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| It is recommended that the policy be retained, thus: | | |
| POLICY TP9 - ACCESS FOR PEOPLE WITH IMPAIRED MOBILITY Development to which the public would reasonably expect to have access will only be permitted if provision is made in the design for safe and convenient access by pedestrians and people with impaired mobility. | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|------------------|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP10 | Public car parks |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| 80 – GoEast - state that the policy reads as statement of intent and should be deleted. 136 – Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce – state that they wish to be reassured that no car parking space will be lost to residential development. | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| The representation made by GoEast is not considered wholly appropriate. However, the additional text proposed should alleviate their concerns, by altering the policy away from being just a statement of intent. With regard to the other representations, the Council considered the use of car parking to be appropriate when it accepted the results of the Urban Capacity Study prepared by consultants on its behalf. The policy allows for the consideration of altered car parking provision subject to demand. It would be unreasonable for the policy to maintain provision where there was no demand. In line with sustainable transport policies, it is considered appropriate that, over time, the number of car parking spaces could be reduced as greater use is made of more sustainable transport options. This is in line with other policies in the chapter and the objectives of the chapter. It is recommended that additional text be added to the policy. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus: | | |
| <p>POLICY TP10 - PUBLIC CAR PARKS</p> <p>The Council will monitor the use of its public car parks to ascertain whether adequate spaces are available, will ensure that the optimum use is made of them and will take steps to alter provision as necessary.</p> <p><u>Developments that create significant levels of traffic will be expected to provide sustainable transport options in preference to on-site car parking. Where this is not possible contributions towards the provision or maintenance of public car parking will be required.</u></p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--|---|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP11 | Public car parks |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>80 – GoEast - state that the policy appears to delegate car parking standards to supplementary planning guidance contrary to paragraph 52 of PPG13. The plan must therefore include parking standards.</p> <p>151 – Churchill Retirement Living – state that whilst they support parts of the policy, the 'expectation' of the council with regard to maximum car parking standards is too onerous and unjustified.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>With regard to the representation from GoEast, whilst it is not mandatory to include the car parking standards within a plan, it is good practice and in line with government guidance. It is recommended therefore that the policy be amended to reflect this. With regard to the other response, the Council considers the use of the word 'expectation' to be appropriate and that the onus should be with an applicant to justify why there is reduced need for car parking provision. The standards listed in the plan are maximum standards except for those related to dwellings in rural and suburban locations.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended as follows:</p> <p>POLICY TP11 - CAR PARKING STANDARDS</p> <p>In considering applications for new development the Council will expect the provision of car parking spaces in accordance with the standards set <u>out below and as shown more fully</u> 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.</p> | | |
| <u>USE:</u> | <u>STANDARD:</u> | <u>JUSTIFICATION:</u> |
| A1 | <u>Shops – food</u> | 1 space per 14m ² |
| | <u>Non-food</u> | 1 space per 20m ² |
| A2 | <u>Financial and Professional Services</u> | 1 space per 20m ² |
| A3 | <u>Take away outlets</u> | 1 space per 20m ² |
| | <u>Pubs and Clubs</u> | 1 space per 5m ² |
| | <u>Restaurants</u> | 1 space per 5m ² |
| | <u>Roadside Restaurants</u> | 1 space per 5m ² |
| | <u>Transport Cafes</u> | 1 lorry space per 2m ² |
| B1 | <u>Business</u> | 1 space per 30m ² |
| B2 | <u>General Industrial</u> | 1 space per 50m ² |
| B8 | <u>Storage or Distribution</u> | 1 space per 150m ² |
| C2 | <u>Hotels</u> | 1 space per bedroom (guest or staff) |
| | <u>Residential Care Homes</u> | 1 space per resident staff + 1 space per 3 bed spaces/dwelling units |
| | <u>Hospitals</u> | 1 space per 4 staff + 1 space per 3 daily visitors. |

| CHAPTER | | POLICY | TITLE |
|---------------|--|---|------------------|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | | TP11 | Public car parks |
| USE: | STANDARD: | JUSTIFICATION: | |
| C3 | <u>Residential Education Establishments</u> | 1 space per resident staff + 1 space per 2 other staff. | |
| | <u>Dwelling houses:</u> | | |
| | <u>Main urban areas/good access to public transport</u> | 1 space per dwelling, | |
| | <u>Urban location with poor off peak public transport services</u> | 2 spaces per dwelling, | |
| | <u>Rural/suburban locations</u> | A minimum of 2 spaces per dwelling for 3 bedroom properties A minimum of 3 spaces per dwelling for 4 bedroom properties. | |
| D1 | <u>Medical Centres</u> | 1 space per full-time staff, + 2 spaces per consulting room. | |
| | <u>Day Care Centre</u> | 1 space per full-time staff, + 1 space per 4 persons attending. | |
| | <u>Crèches/Nurseries</u> | 1 space per full-time staff, + waiting facilities where appropriate. | |
| | <u>Schools</u> (Primary and Secondary Education) | 1 space per 2 daytime teaching staff. | |
| | <u>Schools</u> (Primary and Secondary Education) | 1 space per 2 daytime teaching staff, + 1 space per 15 students. | |
| | <u>Art Galleries/Museums/Public Halls</u> | 1 space per 25m ² . | |
| | <u>Places of Worship/Libraries/Reading Rooms</u> | 1 space per 10m ² | |
| D2 | <u>Cinemas</u> | 1 space per 5 seats. | |
| | <u>Other Uses (Assembly and Leisure)</u> | 1 space per 22m ² . | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|-------------------------|
| 5 - TRANSPORT | TP12 | London Southend Airport |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>4 respondents supported this policy.</p> <p>32 – Essex Wildlife Trust – state that the airport is located in close proximity to the Crouch and Thames estuaries, which are of international importance for birds. Suggest additional text at the end of the first sentence "...subject to no detriment to the environment."</p> <p>42 – English Nature – suggest additional text at the end of the first sentence "... that demonstrates adequate protection and enhancement of nature conservation interests in the area." They also propose changes to the supporting text.</p> <p>66 – Essex County Council (Planning) – state that the supporting text should make reference to a Surface Access Strategy to be produced in association with any development proposals for the airport. They also wish for additional text at the end of the policy "provided suitable transport assessment and other analysis is carried out."</p> <p>81 – Southend-on-Sea Borough Council – state that the issue of surface access to London Southend Airport, in particular in relation to reaching its potential, is insufficiently addressed.</p> <p>137 – CPRESsex – state that the failure of the policy to mention the SERAS consultation or any response made by the Council to this is a serious omission.</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 representations received from CPRESsex and Barling Magna and Sutton Parish Councils are not considered to merit a change to the policy. The issue of surface access to the airport as mentioned by Essex County and Southend-on-Sea Borough Councils is worthy of additional text and this is recommended for inclusion. It is also recommended that the thrust of changes suggested by the Essex Wildlife Trust and English Nature be incorporated too. It is therefore recommended that the policy be amended.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY TP12 - LONDON SOUTHEND AIRPORT</p> <p>The Council will support the operation of London Southend Airport as a regional air transport and aircraft maintenance facility and the full realisation of its potential by increases in passenger and freight traffic, <u>subject to no detriment to the environment</u>. The Council will not refuse appropriate development directly related to the aviation facility <u>provided suitable transport assessment and other analysis are carried out</u>. <u>Future expansion and development plans for the airport, will need to include a satisfactory Surface Access Strategy.</u></p> | | |

BUILDING CONSERVATION & ARCHAEOLOGY

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|-----------------------------|
| 7 – BUILDING CONSERVATION & ARCHAEOLOGY | BC1 | Conservation Areas: General |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>62 – Network Rail – state that the policy should have similar clause included as to BC4 which allows for development if it is in the public interest.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – the first paragraph repeats the provisions of legislation, is a statement of intent and therefore should be deleted.</p> <p>104 – English Heritage – state that the second sentence of criterion iii could be unduly restrictive or invite pastiche. Suggest that the text be amended to “...would be expected to complement...”</p> <p>137 – CPRESsex – state that it would be helpful if the supporting text to the policy contained text about the importance of trees in Conservation Areas and the ability of the local planning authority to serve Article 4 Directions.</p> <p>145 – Rayleigh Civic Society – state that they wish to see the Local List (as contained within the Rochford District Local Plan (First Review) included in the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan.</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> <p>180 – Hockley Parish Council – state that they wish to see a notation for Rural Conservation Areas included on the map and that the settlement of historic buildings around Hockley Parish Church should be covered by such a designation.</p> <p>196 – Hockley Residents Association – state that they wish to see a notation for Rural Conservation Areas included on the map and that the settlement of historic buildings around Hockley Parish Church should be covered by such a designation.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>The Building Conservation and Archaeology chapter is important in the plan because of the wealth of historic buildings within the district. The chapter aims to provide a framework for the Council to fulfil its statutory duty to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas and to protect Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other sites of archaeological importance. The representations regarding the establishment of Rural Conservation Areas are contrary to government guidance seeking a reduction in the number of local designations and it is recommended that no alteration be made with regard to this. Representations made regarding the Local List are likewise not considered to be worthy of adoption. The representation made by Network Rail does not seem to be derived from Policy BC4 and it is not recommended for inclusion. It is recommended that the representation made by English Heritage be incorporated. The representation made by GoEast is also recommended for action. The representation made by CPRESsex and Barling Magna and Sutton Parish Councils are recommended for inclusion in the supporting text. It is recommended that the policy be amended.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| It is recommended that the policy be amended as follows: | | |
| | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|-----------------------------|
| 7 – BUILDING CONSERVATION & ARCHAEOLOGY | BC1 | Conservation Areas: General |
| <p>POLICY BC1 - CONSERVATION AREAS: GENERAL</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Applications for new buildings, extensions and alterations within, or adjacent to, <u>C</u>onservation <u>A</u>reas, will be permitted provided that the following design criteria are met:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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; The proposal uses appropriate architectural detailing to reinforce the character of the conservation area within which it is sited. Architectural details in the <u>new</u> existing building would be expected to complement are retained and faithfully replicated in the <u>existing</u> new development; The external materials are appropriate to the particular building and to the character of the area; and, in the case of shopfronts, the proposal exhibits a high standard of shopfront design, reflecting the traditional character of the particular conservation area. <p>Guidance to be used for the assessment of proposals against the above criteria is to be found in LPSPG7.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|--------------------------------------|
| 7 – BUILDING CONSERVATION & ARCHAEOLOGY | BC2 | Demolition within Conservation Areas |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>62 – Network Rail – state that the policy should have similar clause included as to BC4 which allows for development if it is in the public interest.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state this policy is not required because it repeats guidance produced in PPG15. The policy should be deleted.</p> <p>104 – English Heritage – state that it would be useful to have a contract in place before demolition is allowed to proceed.</p> <p>193 – Rochford Parish Council – state that the wording of the policy is too weak and that it would be exploited by solicitors. Alternative text is suggested “Conditions no less than those quoted by Statutory Provision and in particular the following will be noted.”</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the representations received from Network Rail, GoEast and Rochford Parish Council are not accepted. It is recommended that the representation received from English Heritage be incorporated into the revised policy. By incorporating the English Heritage recommendation the policy is strengthened and it goes further than PPG15.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the text be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY BC2 – DEMOLITION WITHIN CONSERVATION AREAS</p> <p>Consent for the demolition of a building in a conservation area will only be granted in cases where all of the following criteria are met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. (a) the building to be demolished is of no architectural or historical interest and makes no positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area; or, (b) sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the building is beyond reasonable repair, having regard to its structural condition, the cost of repairing and maintaining it in relation to its importance, and to the value derived from its continued use; and that every effort has been made to find compatible alternative uses for the building and to sell it on the open market at a price reflecting its structural condition. ii. detailed plans for the after-use of the site have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. (In cases where the after-use of the site includes development requiring planning permission, such permission must have been applied for and granted in order that the terms of this criterion be met); <u>and</u> <p><u>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.</u></p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|---------------------------------|
| 7 – BUILDING CONSERVATION & ARCHAEOLOGY | BC3 | Alterations to Listed Buildings |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>62 – Network Rail – state that the policy should have similar clause included as to BC4 which allows for development if it is in the public interest.</p> <p>104 – English Heritage – state that the policy would relate to alteration <u>and</u> change of use. It is suggested that the policy should become criteria based.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the representation received from Network Rail is not incorporated, nor should the latter part of the representation from English Heritage. The first part of the English Heritage representation is recommended for inclusion.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY BC3 - ALTERATIONS TO LISTED BUILDINGS Alterations and additions, <u>or changes of use</u>, to a listed building will not be permitted if they adversely affect important architectural or historic features, either internal or external, which contribute to its character, to the scale and proportions of the building or to the preservation of its setting. The choice of materials for new additions to listed buildings will be expected to complement the original materials of construction.</p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|--------------------------------|
| 7 – BUILDING CONSERVATION & ARCHAEOLOGY | BC4 | Demolition of Listed Buildings |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>62 – Network Rail – state that the policy should have similar clause included as to BC4 which allows for development if it is in the public interest.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – state this policy is not required because it repeats guidance produced in PPG15. The policy should be deleted.</p> <p>104 – English Heritage – suggest that additional text should be added to the first sentence to state “...unsound <u>and cannot reasonably be made safe.</u>” They also state that the policy should include provision for the recording and / or storage of features and materials following demolition.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the representations received from Network Rail and GoEast should not be incorporated, but that those from English Heritage should. The comments from English Heritage will help strengthen the policy and will also take it beyond the planning guidance in PPG15, making it contribute to the plan.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>It is recommended that the policy be amended, thus:</p> <p>POLICY BC4 - DEMOLITION OF LISTED BUILDINGS</p> <p>Consent for the demolition of a listed building will only be granted in wholly exceptional cases, where all of the following criteria are met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the building is structurally unsound <u>and cannot reasonably be made safe,</u> and its demolition is required for reasons of safety; and / or ii. all reasonable efforts have been made:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) to maintain the existing use of the building; b) to find compatible alternative uses for the building; c) to sell the building on the open market at a realistic price reflecting the building's condition; and, d) to seek preservation of the building through charitable or community ownership, but that all of these efforts have failed; and, iii. that demolition and subsequent redevelopment of the site would produce substantial benefits for the community which would decisively outweigh the loss arising from demolition; and, iv. in the case of a listed building situated within a conservation area, detailed plans for the after-use of the site have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. (In cases where the after-use of the site includes development requiring planning permission, such permission must have been applied for and granted in order that the terms of this criterion are met). <p><u>Where permission for demolition is granted then provision for the recording and / or storage of features and materials will be required to the satisfaction of English Heritage.</u></p> | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|--|
| 7 – BUILDING CONSERVATION & ARCHAEOLOGY | BC5 | Development affecting archaeological sites |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| 66 – Essex County Council (Planning) – suggested additional text to be inserted: “Application that would affect sites of known <u>or potential</u> archaeological importance...” | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| It is recommended that the representation from Essex County Council be included. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| That the policy be amended, thus: POLICY BC5 - DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES Applications for development that would affect sites of known <u>or potential</u> archaeological importance must be accompanied by sufficient information (this will consist of an archaeological field evaluation, unless advised otherwise by the local planning authority) to allow the local planning authority to assess the importance of the site, the likely impact of the development proposal and, on the basis of these findings, to determine the appropriate course of action. | | |

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|---|--------|---|
| 7 – BUILDING CONSERVATION & ARCHAEOLOGY | BC6 | Development affecting Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other nationally important archaeological sites |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| 80 – GoEast – state this policy is not required because it repeats guidance produced in PPG15. The policy should be deleted. | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| It is accepted that the policy duplicates existing legislation and planning guidance and therefore should be deleted and included as text within the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| It is recommended that this policy be deleted: | | |
| <p>POLICY BC6 – DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENTS AND OTHER NATIONALLY IMPORTANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES</p> <p>Development that would damage a Scheduled Ancient Monument or other nationally important archaeological site, its character or its setting, will not be permitted.</p> | | |

CHAPTER 12 - MONITORING

| CHAPTER | POLICY | TITLE |
|--|--------|------------|
| 12 – MONITORING | LT12 | MONITORING |
| RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>1 respondent supported the policy.</p> <p>80 – GoEast – (i) Chapter should acknowledge need for local monitoring systems, indicator definitions, etc. to support regional annual monitoring report of EERA. (ii) Should be 'statement of intent' and not plan policy.</p> <p>191 – Ms G. Yeadell – policy is irrelevant.</p> <p>154 – Mr. A. W. Squier – Should allocate reserve housing sites in policy.</p> <p>144 - Mr. P. R. Ellaway – Should allocate reserve housing sites in policy.</p> | | |
| OFFICER'S COMMENTS | | |
| <p>Agree that chapter should acknowledge need for local monitoring systems and that policy be deleted and replaced by statement of intent.</p> <p>Disagree that the principals behind the policy are irrelevant as policies need to be monitored to ensure that they are working effectively and where needed, make revisions – in line with PPG11 which highlights the importance of effective monitoring.</p> <p>Disagree that reserve housing sites should be allocated. The authority has more than enough land to fulfil our housing provision as identified in the Structure Plan policy H1.</p> | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | |
| <p>That the policy be deleted.</p> <p>POLICY M1 – MONITORING</p> <p>The Council will monitor the effectiveness of the Plan's policies and proposals on an annual basis in accordance with plan, monitor, manage principles.</p> | | |