

## 1 District Characteristics

### Introduction

- 1.1 Rochford District is located on the south-eastern coast of England. The District is bounded by the North Sea to the east and the River Crouch to the north.
- 1.2 Rochford District shares land boundaries with three other local authority areas. These are Castle Point, Basildon, and Southend-on-Sea to the west and south. The District shares marine boundaries with Maldon and Chelmsford to the north.
- 1.3 The District benefits from regular direct rail links to London via the Great Eastern Main Line. It is served by four stations in Rayleigh, Hockley, Rochford and at Southend Airport.
- 1.4 The District is served by a number of strategic roads including the A130, A129 and A1245, with the A127 running along the District's southern border. These strategic roads provide the District with a good level of connectivity to the rest of South Essex and beyond. The District has easy access to the A12, A13 and M25 beyond its boundary.
- 1.5 The District is also home to the regionally important London Southend Airport.
- 1.6 The landscape of the District is rich in biodiversity, heritage, and natural beauty. It has many miles of unspoilt coastline and attractive countryside. 12,481 hectares of the District's land area is currently designated as Metropolitan Green Belt. Together these qualities result in the District's predominantly rural and open character.
- 1.7 The District is home to thousands of hectares of internationally important habitats along its coastline and estuaries.
- 1.8 Rochford falls within the Thames Estuary regeneration area – one of the Government's national priority areas for regeneration.

Figure 1.1 – Map of Rochford District in context



**Demographic Profile**

- 1.9 As shown in Table 1.2, the population of the District as of the 2021 Census was 85,600 people. This represented a 2.8% increase since the 2011 Census.
- 1.10 As of 2021, around 51.5% of the population was female and around 48.5% of the population was male. These proportions are largely the same as in 2011.

**Table 1.2 – Demographic Profile of Rochford District**


	2011 Census	2021 Census	Percentage growth (2011-2021)
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>83,287</b>	<b>85,600</b>	<b>+2.8</b>
<b>Of which male</b>	40,787	41,500	
<b>Of which female</b>	42,500	44,100	

- 1.11 Statistics from ONS indicate that population density in Rochford is around 517 people per square kilometre, compared to 432 persons per square kilometre for the rest of Essex.

### Population Growth

- 1.12 The population of the District is expected to grow in the future. ONS have published population growth projections up to 2043. These projections are based on rates of births, deaths, and migration.
- 1.13 Projections suggests that by 2030, the population of the District will have grown to 93,533 and to 99,288 by 2043.

**Figure 1.3 – Rochford District Projected Population Growth (ONS, 2021)**



- 1.14 Table 1.4 shows that the population of Rochford District is expected to increase by around 14% between 2018 and 2043. The population increase for Essex is expected to be lower, at around 13% by 2043. The population increase for England is also expected to be lower at around 10% by 2043.
- 1.15 However, these projections are based on 2018 data which overestimated the District’s population by around 3,000 residents compared to the number calculated more accurately by the 2021 Census. These projections may therefore not be fully accurate.

Table 1.4 – Projected changes to population, 2018-2043 (ONS, 2021)

Year	Rochford	Essex	England
<b>2018</b> (Base date)	86,981	1,477,764	55,977,178
<b>2023</b>	89,983 (+3.5%)	1,526,137 (+3.3%)	57,557,521 (+2.82%)
<b>2033</b>	94,925 (+9.13%)	1,601,083 (+8.34%)	59,792,005 (+6.81%)
<b>2043</b>	99,288 (+14.15%)	1,667,768 (+12.85%)	61,744,098 (+10.30%)


### Age Composition

- 1.16 The age composition of the District’s population is also predicted to change significantly by 2043.
- 1.17 Rochford has an ageing population. The percentage of the population aged 65 or over is expected to increase from around 23% at present to 28% by 2043.
- 1.18 By contrast, the percentage of residents aged 40-55 is expected to decrease from around 21% at present to 19% by 2043. The percentage of under 40s is expected to decrease from around 43% to 41% by 2043.
- 1.19 These trends are broadly in line with regional and national trends.

**Figure 1.5 – Projected Population By Age Group of Rochford District 2018-2043 (ONS, 2021)**

Age Group	Projected Population			
	2018	2023	2033	2043
0-4	4,159	4,122	4,269	4,682
5-9	4,842	4,816	4,752	4,971
10-14	4,998	5,379	5,163	5,265
15-19	4,601	4,873	5,233	5,056
20-24	4,577	4,017	4,674	4,415
25-29	4,631	4,880	4,743	5,113
30-34	4,445	4,951	4,593	5,384
35-39	4,847	5,202	5,568	5,485
40-44	5,161	5,520	6,146	5,627
45-49	6,480	5,501	6,246	6,414
50-54	6,739	6,617	6,188	6,701
55-59	6,193	6,678	5,756	6,562
60-64	5,282	6,067	6,456	6,262
65-69	5,212	5,180	6,461	5,734
70-74	5,701	5,101	5,898	6,370
75-79	3,707	5,196	4,734	6,013
80-84	2,856	3,058	3,916	4,702
85-89	1,681	1,904	2,965	2,855
90+	869	924	1,165	1,679
<b>All Ages</b>	<b>86,981</b>	<b>89,986</b>	<b>94,926</b>	<b>99,290</b>

Figure 1.6 –Projected Age Composition Population of Rochford District (ONS, 2021)




**Sex Composition**

1.20 The proportion of females to males in the District is around 51:49 which is expected to remain relatively stable into the future by 2043. This is in line with regional and national trends.

**Table 1.7 – Projected Population by Sex of Rochford District 2018-2024 (ONS, 2021)**

Sex	Projected Population			
	2018	2023	2033	2043
Males	42,597	44,151	46,675	48,980
Females	44,384	45,833	48,250	50,307

**Figure 1.8 – Projected Population by Sex of Rochford District 2018-2024 (ONS, 2021)**



**General Health**

1.21 In the 2011 Census, 96% of the residents in Rochford considered their general health condition to be very good, good, or fair. This is a self-assessment of a person’s general state of health. This is broadly in line with national averages.

**Table 1.8 –General Health Rating of Rochford Residents (Self-Assessment), UK Census (ONS, 2011)**

General Health (Census 2011)	Rochford	England
Very Good Health	48	47
Good Health	35	34
Fair Health	13	13
Bad Health	3	4
Very Bad Health	1	1

1.22 The Castle Point and Rochford Health and Well-Being Strategy 2022-25 sets out a three-year plan to improve the health and wellbeing of residents in Castle Point and the Rochford District.

1.23 It has three pillars:

- People – to improve the health and wellbeing of our residents across all ages and target resource proportionately based on need
- Place – working at a local level to build healthy, active, and thriving communities that people feel connected to
- Purpose – for residents to feel empowered to improve their health and wellbeing, and to build resilience, to enable them to live well

1.24 The Strategy contains a snapshot of health indicators for Rochford District which is summarised at Table 1.9 below. This shows Rochford’s general health to be slightly better than national averages according to most indicators.



**Table 1.9 – Snapshot of Health Indicators (Castle Point and Rochford Health and Well-Being Strategy 2022-25)**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Rochford</b>	<b>England</b>
<b>Life Expectancy at Birth (Males)</b>	81.6 years	79.0
<b>Life Expectancy at Birth (Females)</b>	84.4 years	82.9
<b>% 16-64 year olds Equality Act Core Disabled</b>	14.6	14.5
<b>% of school pupils achieving a good level of development</b>	79.3	79.2
<b>% of adults classed as overweight or obese</b>	62	63
<b>% of adults physically active</b>	73.9	72.9

**Incidence of Crime**

- 1.25 In the year to March 2022, reported crime incidents in the District totalled 4,507, excluding those related to fraud. Less than a quarter of these recorded incidents were theft or burglary offences (919).
- 1.26 The total number of crimes recorded in Rochford District increased by around 13% relative to the year to March 2021 levels where there was a total of 3,985 crimes recorded. Part of this may be a result of the Covid pandemic, where crime rates were likely lower during the 'lockdown' periods prevalent in previous years.
- 1.27 Despite seeing an increase in crime incidence in the monitoring period, Rochford District remains much lower than national and regional averages in terms of the incidence of crime.

Table 1.10 – Number of recorded crimes for headline offences in Rochford District (ONS, 2022)

Type of Crime	Total recorded crime (excluding fraud)	Violence against the person	Homicide	Death or serious injury caused by illegal driving	Violence with injury	Violence without injury	Stalking and harassment	Sexual offences	Robbery	Theft offences	Burglary	Residential burglary	Non-residential burglary	Vehicle offences	Theft from the person	Bicycle theft	Shoplifting	All other theft offences	Criminal damage and arson	Drug offences	Possession of weapons offences	Public order offences	Miscellaneous crimes against society
Number of Crimes (Year to March 2022)	4,507	2,254	0	1	528	815	910	169	33	919	203	164	39	262	17	22	110	305	398	98	23	505	108
Number of Crimes (Year to March 2021)	3,985	1,863	1	1	388	665	808	132	18	817	168	130	38	250	19	24	118	238	401	176	38	436	104

## Household Sizes

- 1.28 In 2011, 24% of households within the District consisted of only one person, which is a notably smaller proportion than regional and national averages.
- 1.29 The average household size in Rochford District is two-person which is in line with the regional and national average. Within Rochford District, over 60% of households are one or two person households.
- 1.30 The proportion of three-, four- and five plus households is broadly in line with the national average.

**Figure 1.11 – Average household size comparison, UK Census 2011 (ONS, 2011)**

Size of Household	Rochford (% of households)	England (% of households)
<b>1 person in household</b>	24	30
<b>2 people in household</b>	37	34
<b>3 people in household</b>	16	16
<b>4 people in household</b>	16	13
<b>5 people in household</b>	5	5
<b>6 people in household</b>	1	2
<b>7 people in household</b>	0.21	0.40
<b>8 or more people in household</b>	0.12	0.28

## Deprivation

- 1.31 The Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) are a measure of deprivation at a neighbourhood level. It is based on multiple different measurements, including income, education, and employment deprivation.
- 1.32 These measurements are combined to provide an overall assessment of the presence of deprivation in a neighbourhood. Neighbourhoods are then ranked into deciles (10%) with those in a lower decile being more deprived than those in a higher decile.
- 1.33 In 2015, 26 Rochford neighbourhoods (of a total of 53) fell into the top 20% least deprived neighbourhoods in the country. Only 5 neighbourhoods fell into the top 40% most deprived in the country, with a single neighbourhood falling into the top 20% most deprived.
- 1.34 In 2019, 28 Rochford neighbourhoods (of a total of 53) fell into the top 20% least deprived neighbourhoods in the country. This represented an additional two neighbourhoods relative to 2015. Only 5 neighbourhoods fell into the top 40% most deprived, with a single neighbourhood falling into the top 20% most deprived.
- 1.35 A total of 17 neighbourhoods moved into a less deprived decile between 2015 and 2019, with only 3 neighbourhoods moving into a more deprived decile.
- 1.36 Overall, Rochford is an area with relatively little deprivation which performs much better than regional and national averages. Since 2015, the relative absence of deprivation in the area has improved, however there remain a few neighbourhoods where deprivation is clearly present, including those east of Rochford town.
- 1.37 Figures 1.12 and 1.13 below show the spread of deprivation in the District in 2015 and 2019. A higher value (greens) represents less deprivation with lower values (reds and oranges) representing greater deprivation.

Figure 1.12 – Presence of Deprivation (IMD, 2015)





Figure 1.13 – Presence of Deprivation (IMD, 2019)

DRAFT



## Planning Land Use Designations

- 1.38 The District is home to an estimated 85,600 people as of 2021.
- 1.39 The three largest settlements are Rayleigh, Rochford, and Hockley. There are four identified tiers of settlements within the District; the first tier comprises these three largest settlements. These are all settlements with a range of services and facilities, as well as good access to public transport.
- 1.40 Of the first-tier settlements, Rayleigh has the best access to services within the District. Rochford and Hockley contain local town centres catering for local needs.
- 1.41 All the District’s settlements have their own identity and characteristics. However, in terms of housing markets and access to services and facilities, it is possible to group some of the District’s settlements: in particular, Rochford and Ashingdon; and Hockley and Hawkwell.
- 1.42 The second tier comprises the large villages of Hullbridge and Great Wakering. These settlements have a more limited range of services and access to public transport is limited. The third tier is made up of the small rural settlement of Canewdon. This settlement has few services and public transport provision is poor.
- 1.43 The remaining rural settlements, including Stambridge, Paglesham and Rawreth, have little or no local services and residents are often completely dependent on the private car to access facilities.
- 1.44 The settlement hierarchy contained within the Core Strategy is as follows:

Tier	Settlements
1	Rayleigh; Rochford/Ashingdon; Hockley/Hawkwell
2	Hullbridge; Great Wakering
3	Canewdon
4	All other settlements

- 1.45 The District’s towns and villages are diverse in character reflecting their history, location, and size. The character, layout, and form of groups of buildings, streets and spaces make a significant contribution to providing a sense of place and adding to the quality of life in town and country. Residents have a strong sense of identity with their own town or village.
- 1.46 There are two wetland areas within the District that are designated as “Ramsar” sites (Foulness and the Crouch and Roach Estuaries). This means they have been identified by the Ramsar convention as being important for waterfowls. These areas are also designated as Special Protection Areas – sites protected internationally for their important habitats for birds.



- 1.47 There are three Sites of Special Scientific Interest in the District, namely the Foulness and Crouch and Roach estuaries, and Hockley Woods. These sites cover a total of 12,986 hectares.
- 1.48 There are also four Local Nature Reserves in the District: Hockley Woods, Hullbridge Foreshore, Marylands and Magnolia Fields.
- 1.49 Around 7,000 hectares of the District, mostly to the east, are identified as having at least a 1% annual probability of flooding from rivers and/or a 0.5% annual probability of flooding from the sea as estimated by the Environment Agency.
- 1.50 The District has a strong historic character, including being home to 328 Listed Buildings, ten Conservation Areas and 7 Scheduled Ancient Monuments.
- 1.51 Other land use designations in the District include land allocated for housing development, employment development and for gypsy and traveller occupation, as well as areas allocated as Metropolitan Green Belt, as education land and as open spaces. This designations are described in the Council's adopted Allocations Plan.

## 2 Local Development Plan Progress

### Introduction

- 2.1 The Council began reviewing its local planning policies following the introduction of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act in 2004. This took the form of a Local Development Framework (LDF).
- 2.2 The current local development plan consists of a number of planning policy documents, including a Local Development Scheme (LDS), a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), a Core Strategy, as well as number of other development plan documents (DPDs) and supplementary planning documents (SPDs).
- 2.3 Following the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012 and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) in 2014, the Council began reviewing its local development plan to ensure that it remains up to date and based on appropriate and relevant evidence.
- 2.4 Changes to the NPPF and PPG have since been made which will need to be reflected as the Council progresses with its development plan review.

### Current Local Development Framework

#### Statement of Community Involvement

- 2.5 The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was adopted by Full Council on 19 July 2016.
- 2.6 The SCI sets out the ways in which the Council will ensure that residents, local businesses, and statutory consultees are provided with appropriate opportunities to make their views known on local planning matters. This includes both plan-making and planning applications processes.
- 2.7 The Council consulted on 'addendums' to its existing SCI in Summer 2019 and was updated in October 2019. The addendums related to neighbourhood planning, data protection and the South Essex Plan, respectively.
- 2.8 The Council consulted on a review of its SCI in Summer 2021 in fulfilment of the statutory requirement for a review every 5 years.
- 2.9 This reviewed SCI is expected to be adopted later in 2022.

#### Local Development Scheme

- 2.10 The Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out timescales for the preparation of the Council's new Local Plan and the South Essex Framework.
- 2.11 The Council last adopted a new LDS in July 2021 which is reported below for accuracy. However it is recognised that elements of this timetable are now out of date.

2.12 The Council will revise its LDS later in 2022 to reflect changes to its plan-making timetable.

**Table 2.1 – Timetable for the preparation of the new Local Plan**

Stage	Target Date
<b>Issues and Options Document public consultation (Regulation 18)</b>	<b>Was held between December 2017 and March 2018</b>
<b>Spatial Options Document public consultation (Regulation 18)</b>	<b>Was held between July / August 2021</b>
<b>Preferred Options Document public consultation (Regulation 18)</b>	Spring 2022
<b>Proposed Pre-Submission Document public consultation (Regulation 19)</b>	Autumn / Winter 2022
<b>Submission to Secretary of State for independent examination (Regulation 22)</b>	Spring 2023
<b>Examination hearings</b>	Summer 2023
<b>Inspector’s Report expected</b>	Autumn / Winter 2023
<b>Adoption by Full Council</b>	Autumn / Winter 2023

### Core Strategy

- 2.13 The Core Strategy was formally adopted by the Council on 13 December 2011 and sets out the Council’s overall vision and strategy for the District up until 2025. The Core Strategy also includes the overarching planning principles and policies that will help to achieve this vision.
- 2.14 Following the publication of the NPPF in 2012, the Council reviewed the Core Strategy and found that it was broadly in compliance with the NPPF. This review acknowledged that the Core Strategy should be reviewed in future.
- 2.15 As part of the changes required by the Inspector who examined the Core Strategy, the Council is committed to an early review of this plan. The Local Development Framework Sub-Committee agreed to an early review of the Council’s Core Strategy on 21 March 2012.
- 2.16 On 19 January 2012, Rochford District Council received notification of a legal challenge to the Core Strategy, brought by Cogent Land LLP, which sought to quash certain policies; namely H1, H2, H3 and paragraphs 4.1 to 4.31 on pages 42-48 of the Core Strategy that related to Housing. The rest of the Core Strategy was unaffected by this challenge.

- 2.17 Formal grounds of resistance were filed with the Court and the hearing was heard over two days on 31 May and 1 June 2012. On 21 September 2012, the Court ruled in favour of the Council, and the application for policies to be quashed was refused.

### **Allocations Plan**

- 2.18 The Allocations Plan was formally adopted on 25 February 2014.
- 2.19 It allocates areas of land throughout the District for specific uses or purposes. This includes the allocation of land for new housing or employment use developments and the allocation of land for environmental protection. The Allocations Plan is also accompanied by a Policies Map setting out the location and boundaries of each allocation.
- 2.20 A legal challenge to the adoption of the Allocations Plan was made to the High Court on 4 April 2014 under Section 113 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The challenge was made on the grounds that the document is not within the appropriate powers and/or a procedural requirement had not been complied with. The legal challenge was dismissed on 19 December 2014.

### **Development Management Plan**

- 2.21 The Development Management Plan was formally adopted on 16 December 2014.
- 2.22 It sets out the Council's main planning policies for determining planning applications and managing development. These include policies on the design of new development, as well as policies governing the nature of development permissible within the Green Belt and town centres.

### **London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP)**

- 2.23 The London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP) was prepared by Rochford District Council and Southend Borough Council as a response to the opportunities and challenges offered by London Southend Airport – located within the District – and its surrounding area.
- 2.24 It includes the allocation of land in the environs of the airport, including for new high-quality business-led development, and policies supporting the operation and vitality of the airport.
- 2.25 The JAAP was formally adopted by the Council on 16 December 2014 and was a shortlisted finalist in the 2014 Planning Awards, under the "Award for Strategic Planning" category.

### **Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan (RTCAAP)**

- 2.26 The Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan (RTCAAP) sets out specific policies designed to support the Council's vision for Rochford Town Centre as a sustainable, vibrant, and historic centre.
- 2.27 The RTCAAP was formally adopted by the Council on 21 April 2015.

### **Rayleigh Centre Area Action Plan (RCAAP)**

2.28 The Rayleigh Centre Area Action Plan sets out specific policies designed to support the Council's vision for Rayleigh Town Centre, including those to manage development within the centre and protect the character of the town.

2.29 The RCAAP was formally adopted by the Council on 20 October 2015.

### **Hockley Area Action Plan (HAAP)**

2.30 Hockley Area Action Plan (HAAP) sets out specific policies designed to support the Council's vision for Hockley Town Centre, including those to manage development within the centre and direct future public and private investment into the area.

2.31 The HAAP was formally adopted by the Council on 25 February 2014.

### **Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)**

2.32 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are documents that provide additional advice and guidance on how policies are expected to be interpreted and applied. The Council adopted a number of SPDs on 11 January 2007 and these came into effect on 5 February of the same year. The documents that still form part of the Council's local development plan are:

- SPD1 – Educational Contributions
- SPD2 – Housing Design
- SPD4 – Shop Fronts Security and Design
- SPD6 – Design Guidelines for Conservation Areas
- SPD7 – Design, Landscaping and Access Statements

2.33 The following SPDs have also been prepared and adopted:

- Playing Pitch Strategy SPD (adopted 17th April 2012) superseded the older iteration SPD3.
- Parking Standards Design and Good Practice SPD (adopted 17 December 2010) superseded SPD5 – Vehicle Parking Standards; and
- Local List SPD 2013 was adopted on 17 December 2013
- Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) SPD 2020 was adopted on 20 October 2020

2.34 SPD 8 – Rural Settlement Areas ceased to be extant upon adoption of the Development Management Plan (superseding the remaining policies in the Replacement Local Plan (2006) after which no policies remain in the Development Plan supporting rural settlement areas).

## **Emerging Plans**

### **South Essex Joint Strategic Plan (JSP)**

- 2.35 In September 2017, the Leaders and Chief Executives of the South Essex Local Authorities, namely Basildon, Brentwood, Castle Point, Rochford, Southend-on-Sea, Thurrock, and Essex County, established a process to develop a vision for South Essex ('South Essex 2050'), including establishing long-term growth ambitions underpinning strategic spatial, infrastructure and economic priorities across the sub-region. This strategic and cross-boundary collaboration will contribute to the discharging of the Council's responsibilities under the Duty to Co-operate.
- 2.36 As part of this process, the South Essex authorities are committed to the production of a joint planning framework to help implement a vision for South Essex. This commitment was endorsed through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed by all contributing authorities in February 2018.
- 2.37 The framework would held provide a strategic context for the new Local Plan, which would provide more detailed planning policies and perform an essential place-shaping role on the ground.
- 2.38 The framework is expected to be a non-statutory document. This means it will not be part of the statutory development plan which planning applications are assessed against.
- 2.39 The framework will be subject to consultation at appropriate stages.

### **New Local Plan**

- 2.40 The Council is currently in the early stages of preparing a new Local Plan for the District. The new Local Plan will set out the strategy for the future development of the district beyond 2025 – the end of the current plan period.
- 2.41 The new Local Plan will replace a number of the adopted policy documents which form the current local development plan for the District. It will set out the Council's strategic vision, policies, and land allocations, where necessary, for meeting future needs. It will also identify areas for protection, such as sites that are important for wildlife and open space.
- 2.42 The preparation of the new Local Plan will be a four-stage process and will be informed by a range of evidence.
- 2.43 There are a number of technical studies that make up the evidence base. The development of these documents is ongoing.
- 2.44 The SCI will help to ensure that local communities and businesses are able to help shape the direction and vision of the new Local Plan as it develops.
- 2.45 In 2016, the Council held community engagement workshops and a survey at the Parish / Town Council level to help identify specific issues and options to consider at an early stage when producing the new Local Plan. The comments received through



this engagement programme were brought together in an Early Engagement Consultation Statement<sup>1</sup>, available on the Council website.

- 2.46 The first stage of the Council's new Local Plan process took the form of the Issues and Options document. This document set out a range of identified challenges and opportunities facing the District over the next 20 years, on issues such as housing, jobs, communities, infrastructure, and environment.
- 2.47 The Issues and Options document was open for public consultation between 13 December 2017 and 7 March 2018. It was informed by a number of key evidence base documents, including the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) 2017.
- 2.48 The comments received in this consultation have been summarised as part of a Feedback Report<sup>2</sup> with an initial response provided. These comments helped to inform the next stage of the new Local Plan, the Spatial Options Document.
- 2.49 Between 28th July 2021 and 21st September 2021, the Council consulted on the Spatial Options Document in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 18. The Document was accompanied for consultation by an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) incorporating Sustainability Appraisal. The comments received in this consultation have been summarised with an initial response provided as part of a draft Feedback Report which will be published later in 2022. These comments will help to inform the next stages of the new Local Plan.
- 2.50 The projected timescales for these further stages are set out in the Council's adopted LDS.

### **Neighbourhood Plans**

- 2.51 Neighbourhood Planning was introduced by the Government via the Localism Act 2011 and enables local communities to prepare statutory plans to guide future development and growth in their local areas. In areas with defined parishes, such as Rochford District, Neighbourhood Plans would commonly be prepared by the Parish or Town Councils.
- 2.52 The Council received an application from Canewdon Parish Council in December 2015 to designate the Parish of Canewdon as a Neighbourhood Area. The proposed area – referred to as the Canewdon and Wallasea Neighbourhood Area – was considered to be appropriate and was approved at a meeting of the Executive on 2 March 2016.
- 2.53 As of April 2022, no other neighbourhood plan areas have been designated within the District.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.rochford.gov.uk/sites/default/files/planning\\_ee\\_consultationstatement.pdf](https://www.rochford.gov.uk/sites/default/files/planning_ee_consultationstatement.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.rochford.gov.uk/issues-and-options-document-feedback-report-2018>

### 3 Housing Statistics

#### Introduction

- 3.1 This section of the report measures the number of new homes built in the monitoring period and the capacity of land within the District to provide homes into the future.
- 3.2 This section will also compare the delivery of new housing with the requirements set out in the Core Strategy (2011) and national policy.
- 3.3 This section will provide an analysis of how new homes have been built in the District, including the proportion of homes built on undeveloped (greenfield) or previously developed (brownfield) land, the size of the new homes, and the number of homes available as affordable housing.
- 3.4 The Core Strategy sets an annual housing target of 250 houses per year up to 2025.
- 3.5 National policy sets out a standard methodology for working out local housing need. This methodology suggests 360 homes per year are needed across Rochford District. As the Council's development plan is more than five years old it is considered "out of date". As a result, its housing delivery is measured against the Government figure of 360 homes per year, as opposed to the local target of 250 homes per year.
- 3.6 **The Council's position with regard to housing land supply is set out in the accompanying Housing Land Supply Position Statement 2022.** This includes the housing trajectory which sets out the number of new homes expected across the District up to 2032.
- 3.7 This Housing Land Supply Position Statement will also consider the Council's position in light of the 'Housing Delivery Test', which was formally introduced through the revisions to national policy made in July 2018.
- 3.8 Performance against key Core Strategy policies is considered further below.

#### The Efficient Use of Land for Housing

- 3.9 Policy H1 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's position regarding the use of land within the district for housing. It prioritises the use of previously developed (brownfield) land and supports the redevelopment of certain industrial estates. The success of Policy H1 will be monitored by recording the proportion of homes built on previously developed land.

#### Extensions to Residential Envelopes and Phasing

- 3.10 Policy H2 of the Core Strategy sets out how the District's settlements will be expanded to meet housing needs over the plan period. The success of Policy H2 will be monitored by recording the number of permissions granted for, and completions of, new homes. This is translated into a housing trajectory (set out in the Housing Land Supply Position Statement 2022).

#### Planning Permissions and Completions 2021-2022

---



- 3.11 Appendix A sets out a breakdown of the sites where housing completions occurred between April 2021 and March 2022.

### Completions in Plan Period 2010-2025

- 3.12 The Core Strategy sets a requirement for 3,750 net additional houses to be built over the plan period 2010 - 2025. Table 3.1 details the completions in the District since April 2010.

**Table 3.1 – Completions since 2010**

Net housing provision requirement, 2010-2025	3,750 houses
Less completions, April 2010 - March 2022	2,573 houses
<b>Remaining requirement</b>	<b>1,177 houses</b>

### Loss of Residential to Non-Residential Uses

- 3.13 Table 3.2 details that no houses were changes to non-residential uses between April 2021 and March 2022.

**Table 3.2 – Houses Converted into Non-Residential Uses**

Houses converted into non-residential uses, April 2021 - March 2022	0 houses
---	----------

### Windfall Sites

- 3.14 Windfall sites are those which have not been specifically identified as being available through the local plan-making process. They are generally previously developed sites that have unexpectedly become available over time, which were not known about when the local development plan was prepared.
- 3.15 Windfall sites have been granted planning permission in line with adopted policies. These could include, for example, large redevelopments of brownfield sites (such as where a factory has closed), or small-scale developments (such as infill development, homes being divided into two, or the conversion of a commercial building into a home).
- 3.16 The Core Strategy took account of homes with planning permission at that time, as well as any other sites considered suitable for housing identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2009. When calculating the contribution to housing delivery made by windfall sites, sites which fall into either of those categories have been excluded. By definition, the calculation has also excluded any houses delivered on sites specifically allocated for housing through the Core Strategy and subsequent Allocations Plan.

- 3.17 Table 3.3 sets out the contribution made to the District’s housing delivery made by windfall sites, between April 2021 and March 2022. The table is intended to show the extent to which windfall sites contribute to the Council’s housing supply.
- 3.18 The figures for windfall completions between 2021 and 2022 show that windfall sites have made a positive contribution to the District’s housing supply in the last year, with many outstanding units set to make a further significant contribution in future years as set out in Table 3.3 below.
- 3.19 These are houses that were not specifically identified in the local development plan, but for which planning permission exists, and which remained under construction or not started at the end of March 2022.

**Table 3.3 – House completions on windfall sites (net), 2021-2022**

<b>Windfall Development</b>	<b>Net House Completions</b>
<b>Houses built (2021-2022)</b>	60
<b>Houses outstanding (at March 2022)</b>	610

### **Affordable Housing**

- 3.20 Policy H4 of the Core Strategy sets out that 35% of housing on sites of 15 houses or more, or on sites greater than 0.5 hectares, must be affordable, subject to viability.
- 3.21 The Council will aim for 80% of affordable housing to be social housing with the remaining 20% provided as intermediate housing, including shared ownership. The success of Policy H4 will be monitored by recording the tenure of houses built.
- 3.22 The South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016) and Addendum (2017), recognise that there are affordability issues across the area. It identifies a need for 238 affordable houses per year within Rochford District.
- 3.23 Between April 2021 and March 2022, there were 145 (net) affordable homes built as part of major development schemes. However, the total figure is likely to be higher once housing association-led developments and acquisitions are factored in.

**Local Housing Market Trends**

*Market Sales and Covid-19 Crisis*

- 3.24 Nationally, house prices have continued to grow, although at a slower rate since April 2013.
- 3.25 The average house price in Rochford District as of April 2022 was £282,753, up by £43,577 from two years ago<sup>3</sup>.
- 3.26 There had been a monthly house price growth of 1.4%<sup>4</sup>, the biggest increase for six months. Increased pressure on household finances, as well as the geopolitical uncertainty due to the conflict in Ukraine, is likely to have a negative impact on buyer demand<sup>5</sup>.
- 3.27 The table below shows that locally, South Essex house prices have risen with Rochford District seeing a 9.02% increase between February 2021 and February 2022, with an average house price of £459.030<sup>6</sup>.

**Table 3.4 – Overall Change in Average House Prices February 2021 – February 2022<sup>7</sup>**

Local Authority	London	Southend	Thurrock	Basildon	Castle Point	Rochford
Feb 2021	£599,059	£364,967	£323,719	£373,542	£365,078	£421,036
Feb 2022	£629,343	£381,979	£330,406	£396,064	£407,706	£459,030
Change (£)	£30,284	£17,012	£6,687	£22,522	£42,628	£37,994
Change (%)	5.06	4.66	2.07	6.03	11.68	9.02

<sup>3</sup> South Essex Housing Market Trends Quarterly Report April 2022 – South Essex Housing Group

<sup>4</sup> South Essex Housing Market Trends Quarterly Report April 2022 – South Essex Housing Group

<sup>5</sup> South Essex Housing Market Trends Quarterly Report April 2022 – South Essex Housing Group

<sup>6</sup> South Essex Housing Market Trends Quarterly Report April 2022 – South Essex Housing Group

<sup>7</sup> South Essex Housing Market Trends Quarterly Report April 2022 – South Essex Housing Group

*Market Rents*

- 3.22 Figures indicate that the cost of private renting in Rochford District has increased over the last year by £4 per week.
- 3.28 As of February 2022, a one bedroom flat in Rochford District was demanding a weekly rent of £166 compared to £162 in February 2021. The gap between private renting and the latest local housing allowance still remains significant in all South Essex local authorities ranging between -£23 and -£42 per week and is widening, with a deficit of -£28 (1 bed flat) in Rochford.
- 3.23 The local housing allowance is sufficient to cover the cost of intermediate rent (at 80% market rent) in all South Essex Local Authorities apart from Rochford and Castle Point. This suggests that homes being offered on this type of tenure in Rochford will not always be affordable to those relying on Universal Credit and not having access to any other source of income.
- 3.24 It is, however, cheaper to rent privately than buying an average resale property in Southend, Castle Point and Rochford.

**Greenfield Land and Previously Developed Land (PDL) Development**

- 3.26 The NPPF states that the use of previously developed (brownfield) land should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist (Para. 84). It further suggests that local planning authorities should make as much use of previously developed land as possible when seeking to accommodate their housing needs (Para. 117).
- 3.27 In Green Belt authorities, like Rochford, national and local policy is that land that is previously developed should be given 'first consideration.'
- 3.28 Historically, 60% of development on previously developed land has been identified as a target, however it is recognised that this may no longer be a realistic target given a lack of previously developed land available to develop within the District.
- 3.29 Furthermore, the development of housing on previously developed land can have negative impacts, such as where it causes the loss of jobs on that land, which will also need to be weighed in the planning balance.
- 3.30 Policy H1 confirms that the Council will prioritise the use of appropriate previously developed (brownfield) land within existing settlements, where possible.
- 3.31 Between April 2021 and March 2022, 406 houses were built on greenfield sites (89% of total), compared to 50 houses on brownfield/urban sites (11%). This reflects the fact that the majority of new houses built in Rochford were on large allocated greenfield sites.

**House Types**

- 3.32 Policy H5 of the Core Strategy underlines the need for a mix of housing types to be provided in the District. New developments must contain a mix of house sizes to ensure they meet the needs of all within the community.

- 3.33 The success of Policy H5 is monitored by recording the size of new homes built in terms of the number of bedrooms they contain.
- 3.34 Table 3.5 provides a breakdown of the size of houses built in the district in 2021-22, on schemes delivering 10 homes or more, where known.
- 3.35 The number of house completions have been based on NHBC returns which are considered to give an overall reflection of the breakdown of houses built generally.
- 3.36 It demonstrates that the most common size of house being delivered in the District is a 3 and 4 plus-bed home. Whilst the proportion of 1-bed and 2-bed homes being delivered is lower, they still made a significant and valuable contribution to maintaining a diverse supply of housing in the District.

**Table 3.5 – House completions by size, 2021-22**

	House Size (No. of bedrooms)			
	1	2	3	4+
Number of known built house size (gross), 2021-22	76	65	142	109
Percentage of total built houses, 2021 -22	19%	17%	36%	28%

**Lifetime Homes**

- 3.37 Meeting the needs of an ageing population is, whilst not unique to Rochford, particularly important in the District in relation to housing provision. It is important that housing is designed to be flexible to changes in people’s circumstances.
- 3.38 Lifetime homes are those that are designed to enable people to remain in their own home for as much of their life as possible; these types of homes are therefore adaptable to the differing needs of people at different stages of their life cycle.
- 3.39 Policy H6 of the Core Strategy sets a requirement for all new houses to be built to the Lifetime Homes Standard, subject to viability, with 3% of new houses on developments of 30 houses or more will be required to be built to full wheelchair accessibility standards. However, use of such standards within planning has largely been discontinued, with these requirements now controlled through building regulations, Part M4(2) (accessible and adaptable houses), and M4(3) (wheelchair user houses), which are not mandatory. The Council does not monitor the compliance of new houses with Lifetime Homes Standards, therefore.

3.40 The Council does require new residential units to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards<sup>8</sup> which provide guidance on minimum gross floor areas, bedroom floor areas, ceiling heights and storage space.

**Major and Minor Schemes**

3.41 Housing developments can be divided into two categories: major schemes and minor schemes. Major schemes are those which comprise 10 or more houses in one location, whilst minor schemes comprise 9 or less.

3.42 In Rochford District, minor schemes often occur within existing residential areas – such as conversions, infills and intensification – whereas major schemes often occur on larger sites that have been specifically allocated for housing in the local development plan.

3.43 Table 3.6 shows the breakdown of housing sites in the District between smaller (minor) and larger (major) sites.

**Table 3.6 – House completions as part of major and minor schemes, 2021-22**

Major and Minor Schemes, 2021-22	Minor (<9 homes)	Major (10+ homes)
House completions (net)	41	415

3.44 The majority of houses built in 2021-22 were delivered as part of major schemes. Most of these houses were delivered on allocated settlement extension sites and brownfield residential sites identified in the Council’s adopted local development plan.

**Density**

3.45 There are a number of factors which need to be considered when determining the appropriate density for a residential development site. However, in the majority of circumstances the best use of land has been achieved by developing at a minimum density of 30 houses per hectare, as required by the Council’s existing policies.

**Self and Custom Housebuilding Register**

3.46 Self-build housing normally means that you manage the design and construction of your own home and may undertake some of the building work as well. Custom build usually means that you work with a specialist developer who will organise the design and construction to help you deliver your new home to your specifications.

3.47 The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 requires the Council to keep and have regard to a register of those who are interested in self-build or custom build housing projects in their area. The purpose of this register is to inform the Council of how much demand there is for self-build and custom build plots in the district.

<sup>8</sup>[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/524531/160519\\_Nationally\\_Described\\_Space\\_Standard\\_\\_\\_\\_Final\\_Web\\_version.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/524531/160519_Nationally_Described_Space_Standard____Final_Web_version.pdf)

3.48 As of 31 March 2022, there were 134 individuals listed on the Council's register.

### **Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**

- 3.49 Policy H7 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's policy in relation to meeting the accommodation needs of the district's Gypsy and Traveller community and includes certain criteria for the allocation of sites.
- 3.50 As of April 2022, there are ten private Gypsy and Traveller sites in the District providing a total of 19 pitches or plots. There is one site with temporary permission. There are an additional 17 pitches or plots across six sites that are unauthorised and not tolerated.
- 3.51 It is important that appropriate locations are identified for sites in order to meet Gypsy and Traveller needs as well as to enable action to be taken against unauthorised sites in inappropriate locations.
- 3.52 The single-issue review to the East of England Plan (Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show people in the East of England) set a total allocation of 18 pitches to be achieved by 2011 through the provision of 15 additional pitches to those already authorised. It also set the requirement for pitch provision by 2011 also set an annual 3% compound increase in pitch provision requirement beyond 2011. This equates to the provision of 15 pitches by 2018 in addition to the seven authorised pitches in order to achieve an increase in provision to 22 pitches to meet the requirements of the review.
- 3.53 The Core Strategy required 15 additional pitches to be allocated in the District by 2018. This was fulfilled upon adoption of the Allocations Plan in February 2014 which allocated land ('Michelins Farm') for the development of a municipal site for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in Rochford District. The site is referred to in Policy GT1.
- 3.54 The Core Strategy also states that given the historically low demand within the District, provision for any additional pitches post-2018 will be subject to a further review of need. This will be considered in the review of the local development plan.
- 3.55 As of April 2022, the Council's allocated site for Gypsy and Traveller occupation, at Michelins Farm (Policy GT1), has not been delivered.



## 4 Housing Land Supply Position Statement

### National Planning Policy

- 4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was first published on 27 March 2012 and was most recently revised in July 2021.
- 4.2 The NPPF requires the level of housing needed in an area to be calculated using a local housing need assessment. This should be conducted using the standard method set out in national planning guidance unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach.
- 4.3 In addition to the local housing need figure, any housing needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas must also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for in that area (NPPF, Para. 61)
- 4.4 The size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community must also be assessed and reflected in planning policies. This includes but is not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to build their own homes (NPPF, Para. 62)
- 4.5 When identifying a local housing requirement and supply, the NPPF establishes the following:
- (Local authorities) should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) can be met over the plan period. Within this overall requirement, strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations. Once the strategic policies have been adopted, these figures should not need re-testing at the neighbourhood plan examination, unless there has been a significant change in circumstances that affects the requirement.
  - (Local authorities) should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability, and likely economic viability. Planning policies should identify a supply of:
    - a) specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period; and
    - b) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan.
- 4.6 The NPPF also states that at least 10% of a local planning authority's housing requirement should be met from smaller sites, i.e., smaller than one hectare, unless there are strong, evidenced reasons why this cannot be achieved.



- 4.7 Whether a site is considered to be “deliverable” or “developable” should be informed by a Housing Land Availability Assessment. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides guidance on undertaking such assessments and replaces all previous guidance.

### **Housing Delivery Test**

- 4.8 Changes made to the NPPF and PPG in July 2018 established the principle of the Housing Delivery Test (HDT).
- 4.9 The HDT measures how well a local planning authority has delivered the required number of homes in its area over the previous three-year period. Further information on how the HDT is calculated is set out in the Housing Delivery Test Measurement Rule Book<sup>9</sup>, published by MHCLG in July 2018, but can be summarised as the below:

$$\text{Housing Delivery Test (\%)} = \frac{\text{Total net homes built over three year period}}{\text{Total number of homes required over three year period}}$$

- 4.10 The HDT requires that where housing delivery has fallen below 95% of the local planning authority’s housing requirement over the previous three years, the authority must prepare an action plan in line with national planning guidance. This action plan must assess the causes of under-delivery and identify actions to increase the number of homes built in future years.
- 4.11 The revised Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that:
- A 20% buffer will apply to a local planning authority’s five-year land supply if housing delivery falls below 85%: and
  - The presumption in favour of sustainable development will apply if:
    - Housing delivery falls below 25% of the housing requirement (up to 2018).
    - Housing delivery falls below 45% of the housing requirement (up to 2019); or
    - Housing delivery falls below 75% of the housing requirement (up to and beyond 2020).
- 4.12 The latest Housing Delivery Test (January 2022) for Rochford District is 103%. As a result, no penalties apply to the Council’s five-year land supply position and there is no requirement to prepare an action plan.

---

<sup>9</sup>[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/728523/HD\\_T\\_Measurement\\_Rule\\_Book.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/728523/HD_T_Measurement_Rule_Book.pdf)

### Local Planning Policy

- 4.13 The Core Strategy, adopted on 13 December 2011, provides the overarching vision and strategy for the District up to 2025. It also sets out how the District will deliver its housing target of 250 houses per year up to 2025.
- 4.14 Due to a number of factors, many of which were outside the Council's control, upon adoption of the Core Strategy in 2011, the Council was committed to an early review in order to put in place a plan that covers at least 15 years.
- 4.15 In order to ensure compliance with the NPPF, which came into force after the adoption of the Core Strategy, the housing target set out in the Core Strategy will also be updated in the early review of the plan in order to fulfil any readjustment of the future target.
- 4.16 A new Local Plan is being produced in accordance with national policy. This will be informed by proportionate and up-to-date evidence, including Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) and Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessments (SHELAA).

### South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

- 4.17 Following the publication of the NPPF, the five South Essex authorities (which, in addition to Rochford District, include Basildon, Castle Point, Southend and Thurrock Borough Councils) appointed consultants, Turleys, to undertake an assessment of housing need across the South Essex housing market area.
- 4.18 The purpose of the SHMA is to assess the need for different types of housing across the area. This assessment is "policy off". In practical terms, this means it looks at how much housing is needed in an area to meet demand but does not take into account whether those homes can actually be built. The assessment is informed by a detailed assessment of demographic and economic projections based on the most up-to-date data to 2037.
- 4.19 The South Essex SHMA 2016, and subsequent SHMA Addendum 2017, concluded that the objectively assessed housing need for Rochford equated to between 331 and 361 homes every year up to 2037.
- 4.20 A new South Essex SHMA is currently being prepared and is expected to be published later in 2022.

### Local Housing Need

- 4.21 Changes made to the NPPF and PPG in July 2018 established a new standard methodology for calculating local housing need. The NPPF states that strategic plans should be based upon a local housing need assessment using the standard method in national planning guidance unless exceptional circumstances justify a different approach.
- 4.22 Using the standard methodology – which supersedes the figures calculated in the South Essex SHMA – Rochford District's local housing need equates to 360 houses a year up to 2032. It should also be noted that unmet housing need from neighbouring

areas may also need to be taken into account when determining Rochford's housing needs.

- 4.23 It is recognised however that the standard methodology figure does not measure the need for specific types of housing, such as affordable or older persons' accommodation. There therefore remains some value in noting the findings of the South Essex SHMA and Addendum.

DRAFT

**Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA), previously SHLAA**

- 4.24 A Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was first prepared in 2009. This was reviewed and updated in 2012.
- 4.25 The NPPF requires local planning authorities to undertake these assessments so that they know how much land is available, suitable and viable for housing.
- 4.26 The Council undertook a “Call for Sites” between 22 June 2015 and 31 March 2016. A Call for Sites invites landowners and other individuals to put forward land that they feel should be considered available for development.
- 4.27 This process helps the Council to identify additional brownfield sites, or other land, that may have become available for housing since adoption of the Core Strategy.
- 4.28 Whether the sites originally identified in the 2012 SHLAA remain deliverable for development has been reconsidered within each successive monitoring report to date and included within the housing trajectory as appropriate. Following the closure of the Call for Sites in 2017, sites submitted for consideration have been assessed in line with the PPG to determine their suitability for development.
- 4.29 A Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) was published in November 2017. The Council re-opened the Call for Sites following the publication of its 2017 SHELAA, which closed again on 31 May 2018.
- 4.30 A subsequent Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) update has been prepared in 2020, assessing the deliverability of sites not identified at the time of the previous assessment in 2017, and alongside the 2017 HELAA and subsequent monitoring, present a robust understanding of the availability of all land for housing and economic development on an April 2019 baseline.
- 4.31 As set out in Table 4.1 below, emerging findings from the 2020 HELAA have identified a total of 113 sites that were considered to be deliverable or developable for housing development with a potential yield of 3,555 houses. The 2020 HELAA identified a further 250 sites that were potentially deliverable or developable subject to policy with a potential yield of 56,749 houses. These sites were generally sites put forward through the Call for Sites that were subject to surmountable policy constraints, including Green Belt or flood risk.

**Table 4.1 – Emerging Summary Findings of 2020 HELAA**

Category	Number of Sites	Number of Houses
<b>Deliverable</b>	105	3052
<b>Deliverable (subject to policy)</b>	235	51961
<b>Developable</b>	8	503
<b>Developable (subject to policy)</b>	15	4788
<b>Not deliverable or developable</b>	18	1477

## Brownfield Land Register

4.32 In accordance with regulations<sup>10</sup>, the Council published an annual update to its Brownfield Land Register in early 2020. This Register sets out a list of sites in Rochford District that:

- Meet the definition of Previously Developed Land, as set out in Annex 2 to the NPPF.
- Have a site area of at least 0.25 hectares OR be capable of supporting at least 5 houses.
- Are considered suitable for residential development (development on the site would comply with local and national planning policies).
- Are considered available for residential development (on best information, the landowner/developer is willing to develop the site); and
- Are considered achievable for residential development (on best information, it would be viable to develop the site within 15 years).

4.33 The Council's Brownfield Land Register 2020<sup>11</sup> identifies a total of 20 sites which together are considered capable of providing a minimum of 720 houses over the next 15 years, and comprise a mix of brownfield sites allocated for residential development in the Council's current local development plan, brownfield sites which currently have planning permission for residential development, and brownfield sites which are considered to be suitable for future planning permissions for residential development.

4.34 Where appropriate, sites from the Council's Brownfield Land Register have been incorporated into the housing land supply figures set out within this chapter.

4.35 The Council will continue to undertake reviews of its Register at least annually and publish these reviews on its website.

## Five Year Housing Land Supply Position

4.36 The starting point for calculating the District's five-year housing land supply is to establish the five year housing requirement. Paragraph 005 of the PPG<sup>12</sup> makes it clear that where a housing requirement in the local development plan is more than five years old, it should no longer be used for the purposes of five year housing land supply calculations and that, in such circumstances, the authority's local housing need figure, calculated using the standard methodology in the PPG<sup>13</sup>, should be used instead.

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/brownfield-land-registers>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.rochford.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/brownfield-register>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-supply-and-delivery>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-development-needs-assessments>

- 4.37 As the Council's Core Strategy was adopted in 2011, it is now more than five years old. As a result, the Council is required to use a housing requirement calculated using the standard methodology in the PPG for the purposes of any five-year housing land supply calculations. The District's local housing need figure for 2022-2027, calculated using the standard methodology, is 1,800 homes or annualised as 360 homes per year.
- 4.38 To ensure that there is a realistic prospect of delivering this figure, the PPG further requires local planning authorities to add on an appropriate buffer depending on the circumstances of housing delivery over the previous 3 years. The appropriate buffer in the case of the Council is 5%, as its Housing Delivery Test performance was not such that a 20% buffer would apply.
- 4.39 The methodology used for the purposes of five-year housing land supply calculations is set out below:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Housing Land Supply (in Years)} \\ & = 5 \times \frac{\text{Deliverable housing supply over next five years}}{\text{Housing requirement over next five years} + \text{appropriate buffer}} \end{aligned}$$

- 4.40 Appendix B sets out the Council's detailed housing trajectory (including the five-year supply) between 2021/22 and 2031/32. From this trajectory, it is possible to identify that a minimum of 3,174 houses are expected to be delivered across the District by 2032, of which 2,176 are expected to be delivered within the next five years.
- 4.41 At this stage, the housing trajectory found in Appendix B only includes those sites with extant planning permissions, allocations for residential development or any sites identified through other means, such as the 2017 SHELAA and emerging HELAA update, which are expected to be deliverable or developable. It is recognised that the NPPF clarifies that sites should only be considered deliverable for the purposes of these calculations where:
- a) (for) sites which do not involve major development and have planning permission, and all sites with detailed planning permission, (they) should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that homes will not be delivered within five years (for example because they are no longer viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans).
  - b) or, where a site has outline planning permission for major development, has been allocated in a development plan, has a grant of permission in principle, or is identified on a brownfield register, it should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years.
- 4.42 Whilst a small number of sites without planning permission have been identified as being potentially deliverable in the Council's evidence base, including its 2017 SHELAA or 2020 HELAA, these sites have not been included in the first five years of the housing trajectory given there is not necessarily clear evidence that homes will be delivered within five years and the Council is able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing without them.

- 4.43 It is recognised that the Council, through its new Local Plan, will need to consider the suitability, availability, and achievability of additional land to meet future development needs, including undertaking an assessment of its Green Belt. At the current time, such sites have been excluded from this trajectory, given their deliverability or developability is not established.
- 4.44 The housing trajectory at Appendix B includes a windfall allowance of 45 homes per year, beginning in year 4 of the trajectory. The windfall allowance only makes a modest contribution to the housing supply figures within the first five years (of 90 homes), nevertheless, a reasoned justification for the allowance is set out in the Council’s 2020 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
- 4.45 The figures provided below should be taken as the Council’s definitive five-year housing land supply position for the purposes of this statement.**

**Table 4.3 – Key Housing Supply Figures (based on requirement of 362 houses per year)**

Local housing need using standardised methodology for assessing housing need	360 houses per year or 1,800 houses over five years
Housing requirement plus 5% buffer	1,890 houses over five years
Deliverable housing supply	2,176 houses over five years

- 4.46 At 362 houses per year, which already factors in previous shortfall, the District’s housing need equates to 1,800 over the next five years. With a 5% buffer, this increases to 1,890 homes.
- 4.47 Within the trajectory set out at Appendix B, the Council has been able to identify a supply of 2,176 houses over the next five years. This supply is sufficient to deliver the District’s housing needs over that period, even with a 5% buffer.
- 4.48 Table 4.4 below demonstrates Rochford District Council’s housing land supply position in years.

**Table 4.4 – Five-year housing land supply scenario**

	<b>Housing Land Supply (in Years)</b>
	<b>Annual Need: 360</b>
<b>Annual Supply:</b>	5.76

DRAFT



## 5 Character of Place

### Introduction

- 5.1 In the Core Strategy, the Character of Place chapter includes two objectives:
- To ensure that new development respect and make a positive contribution toward the built environment
  - To support and enhance the local built heritage
- 5.2 The success of these objectives will be monitored by recording the achievement of the three policies within the chapter.

### Design

- 5.3 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy seeks to promote high quality design that has regard to local flavour.
- 5.4 The success of Policy CP1 will be monitored by recording the proportion of appeals allowed where the Council's refused planning permission based on design.
- 5.5 Between April 2021 and March 2022, six appeal cases were determined following planning applications refused based on, amongst other reasons, elements of poor design or visual amenity. All six appeals were dismissed which suggests that the Council's approach to design is performing well.

### Conservation Areas

- 5.6 Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy seeks to implement the actions recommended in the adopted Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans and have regard to the advice within them when making decisions and recommendations.
- 5.7 Within Rochford District, there are ten designated conservation areas, as listed in Table 5.1.
- 5.8 It is an important component of decision-making to consider the impact of a proposed development on the character and integrity of a conservation area. To achieve this, it is the Council's current practice to seek specialist advice from Place Services on any proposals within conservation areas.
- 5.9 Some minor changes to houses are permitted without the need for planning permission through what are called "Permitted Development rights". Some of these permitted development rights still apply in conservation areas, but can be withdrawn, where justified, through the issuing of an Article 4(2) Direction.
- 5.10 On 11 January 2010, the Council has confirmed an Article 4(2) Direction covering a number of Conservation Areas as recommended in the Conservation Area Appraisals. The areas affected are noted in Table 5.1:

- 5.11 In general, they only apply to elevations fronting a highway, and only apply to houses, and not to flats or commercial properties.

**Table 5.1 – Lists of Conservation Areas within District**

<b>Conservation Area</b>	<b>Date Designated</b>	<b>Article 4(2) Direction Areas</b>
<b>Battlesbridge (Joint with Chelmsford BC)</b>	March 1992	✓
<b>Canewdon Church</b>	March 1986	-
<b>Canewdon High Street</b>	March 1992	✓
<b>Foulness Churchend</b>	March 1992	-
<b>Great Wakering</b>	March 1986 (Amended March 2006)	✓
<b>Paglesham Churchend</b>	November 1973	✓
<b>Paglesham East End</b>	March 1986	✓
<b>Rayleigh</b>	October 1969 (Amended March 2010)	✓
<b>Rochford</b>	June 1969 (Amended March 2010)	✓
<b>Shopland Churchyard</b>	March 1992	-

**Local List**

- 5.12 Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy is set out that the Local List SPD will give protection to local buildings with special architectural and historic value. Between April 2021 and March 2022, no building or heritage asset identified within the Local List SPD was demolished.

**6 Green Belt**

**Introduction**

- 6.1 Policy GB1 of the Core Strategy sought to ensure that the minimum amount of Green Belt land necessary was allocated to meet the District’s housing and employment needs.
- 6.2 The policy directs development away from the Green Belt as far as possible and will prioritise the protection of Green Belt land based on how well the land helps to

achieve the purposes of the Green Belt. Certain types of rural diversification however are supported.

- 6.3 Following the adoption of the Allocations Plan and London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan, 12,481 hectares of the District are currently designated as Metropolitan Green Belt. This compares to 12,763 hectares prior to the adoption of these plans in 2014.
- 6.4 This policy approach is in broad accordance with national policy on Green Belt which sets out the five purposes that Green Belts should achieve:
- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
  - to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.
  - to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
  - to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
  - to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land
- 6.5 To achieve these purposes, national policy is clear that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt will usually be considered inappropriate, except where such buildings are needed for agriculture and forestry, or sports and recreation uses, or where the land is previously developed. The Council's policies within the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan are therefore restrictive on the uses and forms of development that are allowed to take place within the Green Belt.
- 6.6 Policy GB2 of the Core Strategy relates to rural diversification and recreational uses. It identifies appropriate forms of rural diversification that may be considered acceptable in appropriate circumstances in the Green Belt.
- 6.7 The number of change of use applications permitted on land designated as Green Belt, and the nature of those uses, will indicate whether rural diversification is taking place.
- 6.8 There was no reduction in the amount of land within the Green Belt in the monitoring period.

### **Performance against Policy Aims**

- 6.9 Between April 2021 and March 2022, four appeals were determined against refusals of planning permission where the impact on the character or openness of the Green Belt was a reason for refusal.
- 6.10 All these three appeals were dismissed suggesting that the Council's policies relating to Green Belt development are generally performing well.

- 6.11 Between April 2021 and March 2022, three change of use applications were determined relating to land or buildings within the Metropolitan Green Belt, as set out in Table 6.1 below. Of these applications, two were approved. The mix of outcomes from such applications is considered to be a natural reflection of the different site contexts that exist within the Green Belt, particularly given that changes of use of existing buildings can be allowed under national and local policy subject to tests that will be satisfied to greater and lesser extents on different sites.

**Table 6.1 – Change of Use Applications in the Green Belt Determined in 2021-22**

Reference	Proposal	Status
21/01255/FUL	Temporary change of use of the existing storage building, for use by Essex Fire and Rescue for storage and mobilisation purposes	Permitted
21/00732/FUL	Change of use to dog grooming salon	Permitted
21/00226/FUL	Change of use from woodland to residential garden area	Refused

## 7 Upper Roach Valley

### Introduction

- 7.1 The Upper Roach Valley and Wallasea Island have been identified in the Core Strategy as large green open spaces that are important for recreation and biodiversity.

### Upper Roach Valley

- 7.2 The Upper Roach Valley, including the area around Hockley Woods, is an area with special landscape characteristics. There are 14 ancient woodlands in the District and seven of them lie within the Upper Roach Valley, south of the head of the valley formed by the railway line.
- 7.3 Parts of the Upper Roach Valley are already well utilised, such as Hockley Woods and Cherry Orchard Jubilee Country Park.
- 7.4 The Core Strategy states that the Upper Roach Valley will be protected from development which would undermine the area's role as a green space providing informal recreational opportunities. It also supports the expansion of Cherry Orchard Jubilee Country Park and the creation of links with other parts of the Upper Roach Valley. Policy URV1 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's goals for the Upper Roach Valley including protecting the area from inappropriate development, creating a single, vast informal recreational area, and enhancing its natural character. The policy also supports the expansion of Cherry Orchard Jubilee Country Park.
- 7.5 In April 2019, the Council jointly commissioned a Landscape Character Assessment with Southend Borough Council to support the preparation of each Councils' respective Local Plan. This Landscape Character Assessment, now completed and

published, will allow the Council to measure the success of Policy URV1 in terms of the protection and enhancement of the landscape qualities of the Upper Roach Valley.

**Wallasea Island**

- 7.6 Policy URV2 of the Core Strategy seeks to support the RSPB in delivering the Wallasea Island Wild Coast Project and promote recreational use and additional marina facilities in the area, along with access improvements.
- 7.7 The ‘Wallasea Island Wild Coast Project’ is a coastal habitat restoration project on a scale that is unique in the UK and Europe. It involves returning Wallasea Island (situated at the junction of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries, Essex) back to being an extensive and diverse range of intertidal habitats that will be rich in birds, fish, and invertebrates. It also includes the provision of extensive high level transitional zones that will accommodate future climate change induced sea level rise.
- 7.8 Substantial progress has been made with the transformation of Wallasea Island into a restored coastal wetland, including a new circular path.

## 8 Environmental Issues

### Introduction

- 8.1 'Biodiversity' refers to the variety of living species (animals and plants) on earth, and the habitats they live in. It is an important part of sustainable development.
- 8.2 The Council is committed to the protection, promotion, and enhancement of biodiversity throughout the District. This includes protecting areas that are important for animals and plants, such as habitats.
- 8.3 The Essex Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) provides a list of species and habitats where action in the county should be focused. Rochford's BAP translates the Essex BAP into more local actions.
- 8.4 In addition, Core Strategy Policy ENV1 sets out how the Council will enhance and protect biodiversity through the planning system.
- 8.5 Policy ENV1 of the Core Strategy sets the Council's policy for the protection and enhancement of natural landscapes and habitats. It is also sets out how historic and archaeological sites will be protected.
- 8.6 There are a number of locations in the District that have been identified for their importance for animals and habitats.
- 8.7 The majority of the District's coast and estuaries are protected under international law including the Natura 2000 legislation.

### Ramsar Sites

- 8.8 Ramsar sites are important habitats identified based on a range of assessment criteria.
- 8.9 The criteria for Ramsar sites state that a wetland should be considered internationally important if it regularly supports 20,000 or more waterbirds and/or if it regularly supports 1% of the individuals in a population of one species of waterbird.
- 8.10 There are two listed Ramsar sites in Rochford District: Foulness and the Crouch and Roach Estuaries.

### Special Protection Areas (SPAs)

- 8.11 Special Protection Areas are areas protected for their importance to wild birds.
- 8.12 Rochford District has two locations that that have been identified as SPAs:
1. The Crouch and Roach Estuaries SPA qualifies under Article 4.2 of the EU Birds Directive by supporting:
    - Internationally important assemblage of waterfowl (wildfowl and waders)

- Internationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species.
2. Foulness SPA qualifies under Article 4.1 of the EU Birds Directive by supporting:
- Internationally important breeding populations of regularly occurring Annex 1 species: sandwich tern (*Sterna sandvicensis*), common tern (*Sterna hirundo*), little tern (*Sterna albifrons*) and avocet (*Recurvirostra avosetta*).

### **Essex Coast Recreation Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS)**

- 8.13 In December 2017, the Council, in partnership with ten other coastal authorities across Greater Essex, commissioned Place Services to prepare a strategy focussed on protecting wildlife on the Essex coastline from the impacts of new recreational pressures.
- 8.14 With assistance from Natural England, a RAMS strategy has been developed which includes both a technical report and a mitigation report. Together, these reports set out how the impacts of increased visitor numbers to locations with protected habitats will be mitigated through the planning system. These impacts are a consequence, in part, of population growth in the region.
- 8.15 The habitats sites within Rochford District that are included in the RAMS strategy are the Crouch and Roach Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site and Foulness Estuary SPA and Ramsar site.
- 8.16 In April 2019, the Council adopted and finalised the RAMS strategy. The Council has been collecting financial contributions towards mitigation identified in the strategy during the monitoring period.
- 8.17 A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was consulted on in January and February 2020 and adopted on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2020. The SPD summarises the strategy into a concise guide for developers and applicants demonstrating why mitigation is needed. It also sets out the process for how they must comply with the RAMS.
- 8.18 In November 2020, the Council entered into a new partnership agreement related to the Essex Coast RAMS project. Under the agreement, the Essex coastal authorities have appointed Chelmsford City Council to manage the implementation of the RAMS project, accountable to a board comprising each of the authorities.
- 8.19 The Council continues to contribute to the proper management of the project, including ensuring that the RAMS tariff is being used to provide appropriate mitigation measures against recreational disturbance pressures at nearby habitat sites.

### **Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)**

- 8.20 Special Areas of Conservation are intended to protect natural habitats of European importance and the habitats of threatened species of wildlife. They are identified under

Article 3 of the Habitats Directive (EC Council Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora, 1992).

8.21 The Essex Estuaries SAC covers the whole of the Foulness and Crouch and Roach Estuaries from the point of the highest astronomical tide out to sea. The Essex Estuaries have been selected as a SAC for the following habitat features:

- Pioneer saltmarsh.
- Estuaries.
- Cordgrass swards.
- Intertidal mudflats and sandflats.
- Atlantic salt meadows.
- Subtidal sandbanks.
- Mediterranean saltmarsh scrubs.

### **Local Wildlife Sites**

8.22 Local Wildlife Sites (LoWSs) are areas of land with significant wildlife value. They were previously called 'Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation' or 'County Wildlife Sites'.

8.23 Together with internationally protected habitats, LoWSs represent the minimum habitat we need to protect in order to maintain the current levels of wildlife in Essex.

8.24 There are currently 39 LoWSs scattered across the District.

8.25 In April 2019, a review of the District's Local Wildlife Sites was published. This Review assessed the wildlife character and contribution of the District's existing LoWSs. It also assessed areas which are not currently identified as LoWSs but may be worthy of the status in the future.

8.26 This review identified a number of additional sites which are considered worthy of LoWS status. The review will form an important source of evidence to shape and support the preparation of the new Local Plan.

### **National Sites**

8.27 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are areas identified under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

8.28 Natural England has a duty to provide notification of these sites. The SSSI network includes some of the "best" semi-natural habitats including ancient woodlands, unimproved grasslands, coastal grazing marshes and other estuarine habitats.

8.29 There are three SSSIs within the Rochford District as follows:



- Hockley Woods SSSI – A site predominantly owned by the District Council. The site is of national importance as an ancient woodland.
- Foulness SSSI – This comprises extensive sand-silt flats, saltmarsh, beaches, grazing marshes, rough grass and scrubland, covering the areas of Maplin Sands, part of Foulness Island plus adjacent creeks, islands and marshes. This is a site of national and international importance.
- Crouch and Roach Estuaries SSSI (previously known as River Crouch Marshes) – This covers a network of sites (salt marsh, intertidal mud, grazing marsh, a fresh water reservoir) including Brandy Hole and Lion Creek, Paglesham Pool, Bridgemarsh Island and marshes near Upper Raypits. This site is of national and international importance.

### **Coastal Protection Belt**

- 8.30 Policy ENV2 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect and enhance the existing qualities of the coastline, take into consideration climate change and sea level rise, whilst not permitting any development in areas that are at risk from flooding, erosion and land instability. It also ensures that exceptionally permitted development will not have adverse impacts on the open and rural character, historic features, and wildlife of the coast, and must be within already developed areas.
- 8.31 Policy ELA2 of the adopted Allocations Plan called for a small amendment to the Coastal Protection Belt:
- “Parts of the areas identified in Policy SER6 to the south west of Hullbridge are situated in the Coastal Protection Belt. As such a small amendment to the Coastal Protection Belt designation in this location is required.”*
- 8.32 In 2020 the Council published a Landscape Character, Sensitivity and Capacity Study to support the preparation of its new Local Plan. This Study allows the Council to measure the success of Policy ENV2 and ELA2 in terms of protecting and enhancing the landscape quality of the Coastal Protection Belt.

### **Flood Risk**

- 8.33 Policy ENV3 of the Core Strategy seeks to direct development away from areas at risk of flooding by applying the sequential test and, where necessary, the exceptions test. These are ‘tests’ set out in national policy which seek to make sure development does not take place in areas at risk of flooding where it can be avoided, and that any development that does take place is safe for its lifetime.
- 8.34 7,071 hectares of the District have a 1% or more annual probability of flooding from rivers and/or a 0.5% or more annual probability of flooding from the sea as calculated by the Environment Agency. Within these areas, in line with guidance contained in the NPPF, the Council will consult the Environment Agency on any applications submitted for development.
- 8.35 The Environment Agency is also consulted on applications where there is a potential impact on water quality. The Council will only approve planning applications contrary

to Environment Agency recommendation on flood risk or water quality in exceptional circumstances.

- 8.36 In July 2018, the Council published a new ‘Level 1’ Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The Level 1 SFRA provides an assessment of the level of flood risk from a variety of sources including tidal (sea), fluvial (rivers), and surface water, present across the District.
- 8.37 The Level 1 SFRA will inform the Council’s new Local Plan by identifying the areas at risk of flooding from different sources. In time, it will be supported by a ‘Level 2’ SFRA, which will consider the flood risk of locations where new development could be located in more detail.
- 8.38 In 2021-22, the Council approved no planning applications contrary to Environment Agency recommendations based on flood risk. The performance against the target is set out in Table 8.1 below.

**Table 8.1 – Performance Relative to Flood Protection Targets**

	Applications Approved/Resolved to be Approved/Accepted Contrary to Environment Agency advice on Flooding
<b>Target</b>	0
<b>Actual</b>	0

**Water Quality**

- 8.39 Some forms of development can impact on water quality. This may take the form of, for example, development that would result in the inappropriate discharge of pollution into surface water drainage.
- 8.40 During 2021-22, the Council approved no planning applications contrary to Environment Agency recommendations based on water quality. The performance against the target is set out in Table 8.2 below.

**Table 8.2 – Performance Relative to Water Quality Targets**

	Applications Approved Contrary to Environment Agency Advice on Water Quality
<b>Target</b>	0
<b>Actual</b>	0

**Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)**

- 8.41 Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) take different forms but together act to store or slow down the run-off of water that might otherwise increase when development takes place.

- 8.42 Essex County Council has become a SuDS Approval Body (SAB) by the enactment of Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, which passed 31 March 2015. This means that all new development which has surface water drainage implications will potentially require SAB approval and need to conform to National and Local Standards.
- 8.43 Policy ENV4 of the Core Strategy requires that all residential development over 10 units will need to incorporate runoff control via SUDS to ensure runoff and infiltration rates do not increase the likelihood of flooding. In addition, the Allocations Plan 2014 requires attenuation and source control SuDS of a size proportionate to the development should be used such as balancing ponds, swales, detention basins and green roofs.

### **Air Quality**

- 8.44 Policy ENV5 of the Core Strategy states that new residential development will be restricted in Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in order to reduce public exposure to poor air quality. The Council will seek to reduce the causes and impact of poor air quality in these areas.
- 8.45 Between 20 October and 14 November 2014, the Council carried out a public consultation regarding an AQMA in Rayleigh High Street. A large part of Rayleigh town centre down to the A127 was designated as an AQMA in January 2015. Development within this area has been restricted.
- 8.46 In June 2017, an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) was prepared for this area which set out the strategy and measures identified to alleviate the identified air quality issues in Rayleigh town centre.
- 8.47 As of April 2022, the Air Quality Management Area in Rayleigh High Street remains in place.

### **Renewable Energy**

- 8.48 Policy ENV6 of the Core Strategy sets out the criteria for large-scale renewable energy projects in the District.
- 8.49 Renewable energy is energy generated from resources which are unlimited or naturally replenished such as wind, water, sun, wave and waste. It compares to non-renewable energy such as fossil fuels, including oil and gas.
- 8.50 The use of renewable energies can help to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and the reliance on energy sources that will ultimately run out.

#### Large-Scale Renewable Energy

- 8.51 In the period 2021-22, planning permission was granted for a solar farm at South Fambridge Hall with an output of around 49.99 megawatts. At the end of the period, an additional planning application was pending consideration for a potential solar at Great Wheatley Road, Rayleigh with a potential output of around 50 megawatts.

#### Small-Scale Renewable Energy

- 8.52 Policy ENV7 of the Core Strategy seeks to support small-scale renewable energy projects having regard to their location, scale, design, and other measures. Small-scale renewable energy production, such as domestic photovoltaic tiles etc., can make a valid contribution towards the reduction in the reliance on non-renewable energy.
- 8.53 The Government has changed permitted development rights for small-scale renewable energy projects. This now means that, subject to criteria, the installation of solar panels to many residential or commercial buildings does not require planning permission.
- 8.54 For the purposes of monitoring, it means that the Council would not be notified of many of these projects.
- 8.55 While these rights support the Council’s aim to encourage the development of small-scale renewable energy projects as set out in the Core Strategy, they also mean that monitoring of the number of small-scale projects taking place in the District is less accurate.

**Table 8.3 – Small scale Renewable energy projects in 2021-22**

	<b>Solar Photovoltaics</b>	<b>Wind Onshore</b>	<b>Hydro</b>	<b>Biomass</b>
<b>Permissions for installations of renewable energy sources granted 2021-22</b>	unknown	-	-	-
<b>Known renewable energy sources implemented 2021-22</b>	unknown	-	-	-
<b>Completed installed capacity in MW</b>	unknown	-	-	-
<b>MW Generation</b>	unknown			

Table 8.4 – Condition of SSSIs (Natural England)

Area (ha)	Main habitat	Area Meeting PSA Target	Area Favourable	Area Unfavourable Recovering	Area Unfavourable No Change	Area Unfavourable Declining	Area Destroyed/ Part Destroyed	Reasons for Adverse Condition
<b>Crouch and Roach Estuaries</b> (shared with Chelmsford Borough and Maldon District)								
Within the District : 119.36 Total SSSI area: 1735.58	Littoral sediment; grassland ; standing open water; canals; coastal lagoon	99.33 %*	22.87%*	76.46%*	0.67%*	0.00%*	0.00%*	Coastal squeeze; water pollution – agriculture /run off; overgrazing; Inappropriate water levels
<b>Foulness</b> (shared with Southend-on-sea Borough)								
Within the District : 9744.73 Total SSSI area: 10946.14	Littoral sediment; grassland ; coastal lagoon	97.28 %	72.61%	24.68%	0.02%	2.70%*	0.00%	Coastal squeeze; inappropriate scrub control
<b>Hockley Woods</b>								
92.12	Broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland – lowland	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A
<b>Total</b>								
Within the District : 9956.21 Total SSSI area: 12773.84	-	99.77 %	33.46%	66.31%	0.23%	0.00%	0.00%	-

\* These figures are for the whole of the Crouch and Roach Estuaries SSSI, not all of which is in the Rochford District. The figures for this area may be markedly different to those submitted.

## 9 Community Infrastructure, Leisure and Tourism

### Introduction

- 9.1 It is vital that new development is accompanied with appropriate infrastructure in order to create sustainable growth within the communities.

### Planning Obligations and Standard Charges

- 9.2 Policy CLT1 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's policy for planning obligations and standard charges. The Council will monitor the provision of contributions and the infrastructure that is being delivered, once CIL is in place.

### Education

- 9.3 Policy CLT2 of the Core Strategy deals with the Council's policy towards primary education, early years, and childcare facilities in the District.
- 9.4 Policy CLT3 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's policy towards secondary education in the District. The policy supports the reservation of three hectares of land for the expansion of King Edmund School and improved access. The policy also seeks to support the necessary expansion of Fitzwimarc and Sweyne Park schools.
- 9.5 A housing development to the east of Ashingdon (Policy SER5) has provided improved access to King Edmund School. Land has also been set aside for the expansion of the school.
- 9.6 The Essex County Council-produced report '10 Year Plan for Essex School Places 2022-2031'<sup>14</sup> provides detailed information of actual and forecast number on roll and capacity for each area within Essex.
- 9.7 An overview of school place forecasts for both primary schools and secondary schools within the District is set out in Table 9.1 below. Please note, these forecasts reflect the projected capacities within different areas in the District and may not be representative of the projected capacity of each individual school within that area.

---

<sup>14</sup>[https://assets.ctfassets.net/knkzaf64jx5x/5ChkxQBsj08ZWapW7Q7a36/100d0997feb8a82d8ad645f0df1f8f4d/ECC\\_10\\_year\\_plan\\_school\\_places\\_2022\\_2031.pdf](https://assets.ctfassets.net/knkzaf64jx5x/5ChkxQBsj08ZWapW7Q7a36/100d0997feb8a82d8ad645f0df1f8f4d/ECC_10_year_plan_school_places_2022_2031.pdf)

**Table 9.1 – Primary and Secondary School Places Overview**

<b>Area</b> (Primary Schools) [Secondary Schools]	<b>Primary Education</b>	<b>Secondary Education</b>
<b>Rayleigh</b> (Down Hall, Edward Francis, Glebe, Grove Wood, Our Lady of Ransom, Rayleigh Primary, St Nicholas' and Wyburns) [Sweyne Park and Fitzwimarc]	Pupil numbers are forecast to decrease by approximately 75 over the next five years. There is currently a surplus in capacity of around 50 places in reception years. This surplus is expected to decrease to around 15 places in reception years by 2032 when adjusting for new developments and changes in school capacity. A site for a new primary school has been secured on the West Rayleigh development but this is subject to decision by Essex County Council.	Pupil numbers are forecast to decrease by around 140 over the next five years. There is currently a surplus of around 50 places in Year 7. There is expected to be a surplus of around 80 places by 2032. A net-zero carbon expansion to Sweyne Park school has recently been completed.
<b>Rochford</b> (Holt Farm, Rochford Primary, St Teresa's, Stambridge and Waterman) [King Edmund, Greensward]	Pupil numbers are forecast to increase by approximately 190 over the next five years. There is currently a surplus in capacity of around 10 places in reception years. This surplus is expected to become a deficit of around 20 places in reception years by 2032 when adjusting for new developments and changes in capacity. Essex County Council has identified a need for a half-form expansion of a school by 2026.	Pupil numbers are expected to decrease by around 10 over the next five years. There is currently a deficit of around 10 places in Year 7. By 2032, there is expected to a deficit of around 25 places in Year 7. It is noted that These schools draw in a very high number of pupils from Southend. The admissions criteria of the schools will enable them to accommodate local children before Southend children as local demand grows. ECC are in contact with Southend City Council about this.

<b>Area</b> (Primary Schools) [Secondary Schools]	<b>Primary Education</b>	<b>Secondary Education</b>
<p><b>Hockley</b>                      (Ashingdon Primary, Hockley Primary, Plumberow and Westerings)</p> <p>[Please note: for the purposes of school place planning, Greensward Academy is addressed under the Rochford area above]</p>	<p>Pupil numbers are forecast to decrease by approximately 60 over the next five years. There is currently a surplus of around 30 places in reception years. This surplus is expected to decrease to around 10 places in reception years by 2032 when adjusting for new developments and changes in capacity.</p>	<p><i>See Rochford above</i></p>
<p><b>Barling / Gt Wakering</b>                      (Barling Magna and Great Wakering Primary)</p>	<p>Pupil numbers are forecast to increase by around 10 over the next five years. There is currently a deficit of around 7 spaces in reception years. This deficit is expected to remain stable by 2032 when adjusting for new development. Plans are underway for a small expansion to Barling Magna Primary.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Canewdon</b>                      (Canewdon Endowed Primary)</p>	<p>Pupil numbers are forecast to remain stable over the next five years. There is currently a surplus of around 10 places in reception years. This surplus is expected to decrease slightly to around 5 places by 2032 when adjustment for new developments and changes in capacity.</p>	<p>N/A</p>



Area (Primary Schools) [Secondary Schools]	Primary Education	Secondary Education
<b>Ungrouped</b> (Riverside, Hullbridge)	Pupil numbers are expected to increase by around 40 over the next five years. There is currently a deficit of around 5 places in reception years. There is expected to be a deficit of around 10 places by 2032 when adjusting for new developments. Plans are underway for a half-form entry expansion to Riverside Primary by 2023.	N/A

**Healthcare**

- 9.8 Policy CLT4 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council’s policy towards healthcare provision in relation to development in the District. It seeks to ensure that the Council works with local healthcare providers to ensure that needs are provided for. New residential developments over 50 dwellings and non-residential developments over 1000 square metres will also need to be accompanied by a Health Impact Assessment for example.
- 9.9 The Council will work closely together with local NHS bodies to ensure that there are adequate healthcare facilities available to serve the District’s population. Larger housing developments are required to make financial contributions towards expanding local healthcare facilities.
- 9.10 The later chapter on Planning Obligations, and Appendix C, provides an account of the funding available for healthcare facilities from local developments.

**Open Space**

- 9.11 Policy CLT5 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council’s approach to incorporating, protecting, and enhancing open space in relation to development in the District. New public open space will be sought to support new development, and existing uses will be protected.
- 9.12 Within the period 2020-21, an assessment of open space was undertaken as part of an emerging Open Space Study. This Study identified a total of 23 new open spaces that had been provided as part of housing developments since 2009 when the previous study was published.
- 9.13 Other new open spaces will be created in the coming years as part of developments which have recently received planning permission and still under construction within this monitoring period. The provision of such open spaces will be reported upon in future Authority Monitoring Reports.

### **Community Facilities**

- 9.14 Policy CLT6 of the Core Strategy sets the Council's approach to safeguarding and enhancing community facilities in relation to development in the District. The Council requires due consideration to be given to the provision of community facilities within appropriate planning applications.
- 9.15 There has been no provision of new community facilities delivered as a result of new development in the period 2021-22.

### **Play Space**

- 9.16 Policy CLT7 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's approach to the provision of play space in the District which supported the provision of new facilities alongside new residential development.
- 9.17 There has been no provision of new play spaces delivered as a result of new development in the period 2021-22.

### **Youth Facilities**

- 9.18 Policy CLT8 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's position regarding youth facilities within the District. Additional facilities for young people will be supported within appropriate locations where a need has been identified and which are accessible by a range of transport options.
- 9.19 There has been no provision of new youth facilities in the District delivered as a result of new development in the period 2021-22.

### **Leisure Development**

- 9.20 Policy CLT9 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's aims regarding leisure facilities in the District, for example maintaining and enhancing current facilities, and making the best use of existing facilities in the District by encouraging those such as within school premises to be made accessible to all. The District contains both private and public sports facilities. Sport England notes the following leisure facilities as available in Rochford District, as outlined in Table 9.2.

- 9.21 The demand for leisure facilities can be estimated using Sport England’s Sports Facility Calculator. This calculated the demand for various leisure facilities in an area based on local population profiles together with a profile of usage.
- 9.22 The Council, in partnership with other Councils in South Essex, commissioned Knight Kavanagh Page to prepare Playing Pitch and Built Facilities Strategies. These Strategies were published in April 2019 and provide an up to date source of quantitative and qualitative information on both current and future playing pitch and built facility needs in the District and how these relate to the supply and demand for facilities in neighbouring authorities.
- 9.23 The demand is an estimate and it should be noted that the District does not sit in a vacuum and that the development of leisure facilities outside of the District and the movement of people between Districts will influence the demand for leisure services of a particular locality.
- 9.24 Table 9.2 compares the demand for leisure and recreational uses in the District, as calculated using Sport England’s Sports Facility Calculator, with the facilities provided.

**Table 9.2 – Demand for leisure and recreational uses in the District**

Facility	Supply	Facilities Requirement	Shortfall of Supply from Demand
Swimming pools	1884.5 m <sup>2</sup>	872.46 m <sup>2</sup>	0
Sports courts	41	23.27 courts	0
Artificial grass pitches	4	2.29	0
Indoor bowls	4	6.92 rinks	2.92

- 9.25 Table 9.2 suggests that there is currently no shortfall of swimming pools, sports courts, or artificial grass pitches in the District.

### Swimming Pools

- 9.26 The location of swimming pools in the District – both public and private – is set out in Table 9.3 below.

**Table 9.3 – Location of swimming pools**

Name	Location	Swimming Pool Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Owner Type
Athenaeum Club	Rochford	300	Commercial
Clements Hall Leisure Centre	Hockley	425	Local Authority
Great Wakering Primary School	Great Wakering	242	School
Greensward Academy	Hockley	142.5	School
Holt Farm Junior School	Rochford	80	School

Name	Location	Swimming Pool Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Owner Type
King Edmund Business and Enterprise School	Rochford	180	School
Our Lady of Ransom	Rayleigh	66	School
Riverside Primary School	Hullbridge	105	School
Sweyne Park School	Rayleigh	152	School
'Swimming Tales'	Rayleigh	96	Commercial
Waterbabies The Croft	Hockley	N/A	Commercial
Waterman Primary Academy	Rochford	96	School
<b>Total</b>		<b>1884.5</b>	

### Sports Halls

9.27 The location of sports hall in the District – both public and private – is set out in Table 9.4 below. Of these, halls with some form of community use are highlighted in green.

**Table 9.4 – Location of sports halls**

Name	Location	Number of Courts	Owner Type
Clements Hall Leisure Centre	Hockley	9	Local Authority
Elite Fitness Gym	Rochford	1	Commercial
Fitzwimarc School	Rayleigh	7	School
Great Wakering Primary School	Great Wakering	1	School
Greensward Academy	Hockley	5	School
Grove Wood Primary School	Rayleigh	1	School
King Edmund Business and Enterprise School	Rochford	5	School
Rayleigh Leisure Centre	Rayleigh	4	Local Authority
Plumberow Primary Academy	Hockley	2	School

Name	Location	Number of Courts	Owner Type
<b>Samantha Boyd School of Dance</b> (previously Great Wakering Leisure Centre)	Great Wakering	3	Local Authority / Commercial
<b>Sweyne Park School</b>	Rayleigh	4	School
<b>Total</b>		<b>41</b>	

**Artificial Grass Pitches**

9.28 The location of artificial grass pitches in the District is set out in Table 9.5 below.

**Table 9.5 – Location of artificial grass pitches**

Name	Location	Pitches	Owner Type
<b>Clements Hall Leisure Centre</b>	Hockley	1	Local Authority
<b>Greensward Academy</b>	Hockley	1	School
<b>King Edmund Business and Enterprise School</b>	Rochford	1	School
<b>Sweyne Park School</b>	Rayleigh	1	School
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	

**Indoor Bowls**

9.29 The location of indoor bowls facilities in the District – both public and private – is set out in Table 1.6 below.

**Table 1.6 – Location of indoor bowls facilities**

Name	Location	Rinks	Owner Type
<b>Rayleigh Leisure Centre</b>	Rayleigh	4	Local Authority
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	

**Leisure Developments 2021-22**

9.30 In the period between April 2021 and March 2022, one application for planning permission was approved for the provision of new leisure floorspace.

9.31 For the purposes of this table, leisure floorspace is considered to be any use falling within the new Classes E, F.2 and Sui Generis (previously Class D2) which is recreational in nature. This application is set out in Table 9.7 below.

**Table 9.7 – Applications approved for new leisure floorspace, 2021-22**

Application reference	Description	New floorspace
21/00974/FUL	Proposed Change of use of Unit 27 from B1/B8 Light Industrial and Storage to Class E(d) Indoor Sport and Recreation. Including Internal Alteration and Creation of New Main Entrance.	152m <sup>2</sup>

### **Playing Pitches**

9.32 Policy CLT10 of the Core Strategy outlines the Council’s policy towards playing pitches in the District, which seeks to support the provision of new pitches where appropriate – in accordance with specific criteria – and resist the loss of existing facilities. In the period 2021-22, one application was approved for the provision of a new indoor playing pitch as detailed in Table 9.7 above.

### **Tourism**

9.33 The Council’s Growth Strategy for the District will be used in conjunction with planning policy documents to drive forward the Council’s goals for tourism in the District.

9.34 Policy CLT10 of the Core Strategy seeks to support appropriate green tourism projects in the District such as bed and breakfasts/hotels. The Council continues to support green tourism initiatives on an ad hoc basis, where these comply with planning policy.

## 10 Transport

### Introduction

- 10.1 Rochford District has high levels of car ownership with only 14.5% of households in the District not owning a car or van (2011 Census). The District is also subject to high levels of out-commuting and has limited public transport provision in rural areas.
- 10.2 The Council works alongside Essex County Council, who are the transport authority for Rochford District, to ensure that the strategic and local road networks are maintained and upgraded where necessary.

### Highways

- 10.3 Policies T1 and T2 of the Core Strategy set out the Council's approach regarding highways issues and their relationship with development in the District.
- 10.4 Policy T1 states that the Council will work with developers and the Highway Authority to ensure that necessary improvements are carried out and will seek developer contributions where appropriate. Improvements to the east to west road network will also be supported.
- 10.5 In addition, Policy T2 identifies specific roads and junctions where improvements should be prioritised, in particular:
- Brays Lane, Ashingdon;
  - Ashingdon Road;
  - Rectory Road/Ashingdon Road roundabout;
  - Watery Lane;
  - Spa Road/Main Road roundabout;
  - Rayleigh Weir junction;
  - The B1013; and
  - Surface access to London Southend Airport.
- 10.6 In the period 2021-22, road improvements were undertaken by the Highway Authority to the junction of Rawreth Lane / Hullbridge Road (not identified in Policy T2), and earlier, improvements have been undertaken to the B1013, Brays Lane, Ashingdon, Watery Lane and the Rayleigh Weir junction.
- 10.7 Rochford District Council are not the transport authority for the District and so are not directly responsible for maintaining the local road or public transport network. However, the Council continues to work closely with Essex County Council to support these priorities for road and junction improvements, seeking developer contributions and supporting funding bids where appropriate. For example, improvements to the



access to King Edmund School were delivered alongside the development of land to the east of Ashingdon (Policy SER5 in the 2014 Allocations Plan).

**Public Transport**

- 10.8 Policy T3 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council’s position regarding public transport and future development within the District.
- 10.9 For example, large-scale residential developments will be required to connect with public transport and be designed in a way that encourages the use of alternative forms of transport to the private car.
- 10.10 This relates to Policy T1 which states that developments will be required to be located and designed in such a way as to reduce use of the private car. Locating development so that local shops and services and employment opportunities can be accessed through sustainable modes of travel (e.g. walking or public transport) is key to achieving this.
- 10.11 In the period 2021-22, five large-scale housing developments saw homes completed on them. These are listed in Table 10.1.
- 10.12 Through walking, cycling, or using public transport, residents of these sites would generally be able to access a GP surgery, a primary and secondary school, and a major employment site within thirty minutes.

**Table 10.1 – Access to services within 30 minutes for new residential development**

Reference	Address	Access to services within 30 minutes
<b>16/00668/OUT / 12/00252/FUL</b>	Land Between Star Lane and Alexandra Road South of High Street Great Wakering	Yes
<b>16/00183/REM /17/00582/FUL</b>	Land West Of Oak Road And North Of Hall Road Rochford	Yes
<b>14/00813/OUT</b>	Land Between Windmere Avenue And Lower Road Malyons Lane Hullbridge	Yes
<b>15/00362/OUT</b>	Land North of London Road And South Of Rawreth Lane And West Of Rawreth Industrial Estate Rawreth Lane Rayleigh	Yes
<b>19/01184/REM</b>	Land North Of London Road West Of Rawreth Industrial Estate Rawreth Lane Rayleigh (Parcel F)	Yes

**Accessibility of New Housing**

- 10.13 It is important that the accessibility of services from new developments is given consideration in the planning process. It is also important that the location of development helps people to reduce their need to travel by private car.
- 10.14 This presents a particular challenge to Rochford District with its rural areas and high levels of car ownership.
- 10.15 Figures 10.1-10.5 illustrates the accessibility of sites to key facilities including school, retail, healthcare, and employment opportunities.

**Figure 10.2 – Accessibility of Primary Schools in Rochford District (ECC, 2010)**




Figure 10.3 – Accessibility of Secondary Schools in Rochford District (ECC, 2010)




Figure 10.4 – Accessibility of Retail Centres in Rochford District (ECC, 2010)






Figure 10.5 – Accessibility of GP Surgeries in Rochford District (ECC, 2010)





Figure 10.6 – Accessibility of Employment Centres in Rochford District (ECC, 2010)



10.16 To enable Policy T2 to be monitored, the Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to resolve any highways issues which arise across the District.

Local Travel Preferences

- 10.17 Monitoring the ways local people choose to travel to work is a useful indicator of the attractiveness and quality of public transport options relative to private cars.
- 10.18 The proportion of residents travelling to work by car or van is largely in line with county and regional averages, at around 40%, however this is considerably higher than the national average of 35%. This is likely due to the greater availability of public transport options in more urban areas which have a bearing on the national figures.
- 10.19 The District has a significantly higher proportion of residents travelling to work by train, 10.6%, when compared to regional, national, and county trends. This is likely due to a high proportion of the District’s residents commuting into Greater London and the relative accessibility of train stations to much of the District’s population.
- 10.20 The number of residents opting to walk or cycle to work is lower than that found at regional and county levels, likely due to the rural nature of much of the District, the lack of integrated long-distance walking and cycling networks, and high levels of long-distance commuting.
- 10.21 Table 10.7 below details the primary methods that residents use to travel to work.

**Table 10.7 – Rochford residents’ preferred method of travel to work (%) (Census, 2011)**

Method	Rochford	Essex	East	England
Train	10.6	8.4	5.4	5.9
Bus	2.2	2.1	2.4	4.7
Car/Van	39.6	38	39	34.8
Bicycle	0.8	1.4	2.3	1.8
Walk	3.4	5.5	6.1	6.3
Other	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.1
Not in employment/work from home	39.7	40.4	40.3	42.2

**Travel Plans**


- 10.22 Policy T5 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council’s policy for the inclusion of travel plans as part of developments of an appropriate size in the District.
- 10.23 Travel plans continue to be sought on any developments greater than 50 units within the District.

## Cycling and Walking

- 10.24 Policy T6 of the Core Strategy supports the delivery of cycling and walking routes through the District. The Council will work with Essex County Council and other organisations to deliver these.
- 10.25 National Route 16 runs to the south of Rayleigh town centre, providing a 41 mile cycle link between Southend-on-Sea, Shoeburyness and Basildon. A cycle network through the District was identified in the Core Strategy (proposed National Cycle Network 135) to connect the settlements of Battlesbridge, Hullbridge, Rayleigh, Hockley, Hawkwell and Rochford to London Southend Airport. Following adoption of the Core Strategy a feasibility study was undertaken by Sustrans on the development of proposed National Cycle Network 135. Funding opportunities are being sought for the delivery of this route including through the planning application process. Opportunities for other cycling routes to be delivered in the District are also being explored.
- 10.26 The district's main town centres – Rochford, Rayleigh, and Hockley – have adequate cycle parking that is centrally located. Each of the major residential sites allocated in the Core Strategy include a requirement for enhancements to the local cycle network as well as a link to the proposed National Cycle Network where appropriate.
- 10.27 Essex County Council has prepared an Essex Cycle Strategy which was adopted in June 2016. This will be followed by District/Borough specific action plans. The Rochford Cycling Strategy, led by Essex County Council as the Highway Authority, was completed in January 2018.
- 10.28 The main residential site allocations within the Core Strategy include enhancements to local pedestrian routes as part of the infrastructure to accompany new development. The District will benefit from a number of enhanced walking routes as allocated developments are built out.
- 10.29 Policy T7 of the Core Strategy states the Council will support the delivery of a number of greenways identified in the Green Grid Strategy 2005 which are of relevance to Rochford District. Further information will be included when it becomes available.
- 10.30 Throughout the monitoring period, the Council has supported the [Natural England Coastal Path](#) and [Path to Prosperity](#) projects. These relate to proposals for improved walking facilities around the coastline, including in Rochford.
- 10.31 In October 2019, Natural England consulted on proposals relating to the stretch of the coastal path between Southend and Wallasea Island. Objections were forwarded for consideration by an independent planning inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. On 18 March 2021, the Secretary of State approved the remaining section of the England Coast Path between Southend-on-Sea and Wallasea Island. Work is now underway to prepare the new stretch of coast path for public use. The first step is to contact owners and occupiers of the affected land to discuss the design and location of any new infrastructure which is needed, such as signs and gates. When preparations are complete, new access rights will come into force along the route.



Figure 10.8 – Map of Coastal Path from Southend to Wallasea (Natural England, 2019)



## Parking

10.32 Policy T8 of the Core Strategy concerns parking standards. Minimum parking standards, including visitor parking, will be applied to residential development; whereas maximum standards will be applied for trip destinations provided that adequate provision is delivered. This is supported by the Parking Standards Design and Good Practice Supplementary Planning Document.

## 11 Economic Development

### Introduction

- 11.1 Rochford District is located at the eastern end of the Thames Gateway. The Thames Gateway is a term that refers to a large area along the course of the River Thames that has historically been a Government focus for growth.
- 11.2 The Council has embraced the key concepts of the Thames Gateway initiative and is a fully active partner in the Thames Estuary Commission and subsequently Board.
- 11.3 The Thames Estuary Growth Board brings together key business and political leaders from across South Essex, North Kent, East London, the City of London and the River Thames to form a single voice to drive forward economic growth in the area.
- 11.4 Growth associated with the Thames Estuary, and in particular London Southend Airport, will provide a key source of employment in coming years. This will be supported by economic growth beyond the District's boundary, supported by nearby projects including Lower Thames Crossing and the Thames Freeport.
- 11.5 The emerging Airport Business Park and nearby Aviation Way industrial estates provide a base for a number of specialist engineering and maintenance jobs, whilst significant employment opportunities are also concentrated in the District's other employment sites, including Purdeys and Brook Road Industrial Estates.

### Employment Growth

- 11.6 Policy ED1 of the Core Strategy sets out specific projects and opportunities that the Council will support. These include the development of Cherry Orchard Jubilee County Park and the Wallasea Island Wild Coast Project, the enhancement of London Southend Airport and the District's commercial centres.
- 11.7 The success of this policy will be based on the proportion of employment development within 30 minutes public transport time. The Council will also monitor the total amount of additional floorspace by type and employment land available by type.
- 11.8 Key accessibility facts are provided below:
- 65% of Rochford residents live within 15 minutes travel of one of the District's retail centres.
  - 89% of Rochford residents live within 30 minutes travel of one of the Districts retail centres.
  - 69% of Rochford residents live within 15 minutes travel of one of the District's employment sites.
  - 98% of Rochford residents live within 30 minutes travel of one of the District's employment sites.

### London Southend Airport and Environs

- 11.9 Policy ED2 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's aims for the airport, including expressing support for development of the airport, a skills training academy, and the preparation of a joint plan with Southend City Council.



11.10 The London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan (also known as the JAAP) was formally adopted by Rochford District Council on 16 December 2014. The JAAP will provide the basis for coordinating the actions of a range of partners with an interest in London Southend Airport and its surrounding area and establish planning policies up to 2031 of which thereafter future policies will be addressed within the new emerging Rochford District Local Plan. Until then the JAAP will:

- Manage growth and change in the area by setting out development and design principles
- Ensure the protection of areas and places sensitive to change
- Direct investment and form the basis for regeneration in the area
- Be deliverable

11.11 In accordance with the JAAP, an outline planning application for land to the north of London Southend Airport for the development of the new Airport Business Park was approved in October 2016. At the outline planning application stage, new floorspace is predominantly allocated to B1 and B2 uses (approximately 80,000m<sup>2</sup>), with around 7,000m<sup>2</sup> being allocated to ancillary uses including C1, A1, A3, A4, D1, D2 and B8.

11.12 Since the granting of outline planning permission for Airport Business Park, a number of detailed planning permissions have been granted for new employment space within the park. In 2020-21, key milestones were achieved on the park, including:

- Significant progress towards the completion of the Launchpad innovation facility (19/00566/REM)
- Significant progress towards the completion of the 'Quad' scheme of twelve commercial units (20/00454/REM)
- The opening of the 'Costa Coffee' facility on the park (20/00565/REM)

11.13 Further plots on the park continue to come forward for detailed planning applications. These will be reported on in future monitoring reports.

11.14 Planning permission was also granted in January 2018 for an extension to the Airport terminal building; in part, to help facilitate the Airport's growth ambitions.

### **Updated Changes to The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020**

11.15 From 1<sup>st</sup> September 2020, the Government made fundamental changes to the Use Classes Order. The Use Classes Order puts the use of buildings and land into different categories (or "classes"). For example, a building used as a house sits in one class whilst a building used a shop would sit in another category.

11.16 These changes included a new "Class E" which takes in uses from what were previously a large number of different classes.

11.17 Class E covers uses that are for ‘commercial, business and service’ – including retail, restaurant, office, financial / professional services, indoor sports, medical and nursery uses along with “any other services which it is appropriate to provide in a commercial, business or service locality”.

11.18 These changes are important because the Council’s adopted policies make reference to Use Classes which may no longer exist in their own right, or which were intended to restrict uses in a way that is no longer achievable. The reason for this is that the Government has stated that planning permission is not required to change the use of buildings from certain classes to others. The new Class E means that a large range of commercial uses that would previously have required planning permission to change may no longer do so.

### **Existing Employment Land**

11.19 Policy ED3 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council’s goals for existing employment land in the District. There are a number of industrial estates allocated primarily for B1 (Light Industry/Offices), B2 (General Industry), and B8 (Warehousing and Distribution) uses.

11.20 The Council continues to protect existing employment land within the District. This includes restricting uses within these areas to appropriate business uses, as far as possible.

11.21 Through its Allocations Plan, the Council has allocated four employment land sites for appropriate alternative uses, predominantly housing. This is due to the location and condition of these existing industrial estates.

11.22 The following employment sites will be protected in the long-term, in order to safeguard jobs and the local economy:

- Baltic Wharf, Wallasea Island
- Swaines Industrial Estate, Ashingdon
- Purdeys Industrial Estate, Rochford
- Riverside Industrial Estate, Rochford
- Rochford Business Park, Cherry Orchard Way, Rochford
- Imperial Park Industrial Estate, Rayleigh
- Brook Road Industrial Estate, Rayleigh
- Northern section of Aviation Way Industrial Estate, Southend

11.23 The following employment sites have been reallocated for residential/mixed use development, due to their location and condition:

- Star Lane Industrial Estate, Great Wakering

- Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate, Hockley
- Stambridge Mills, Rochford
- Rawreth Industrial Estate, Rayleigh

11.24 Whilst the redevelopment of the above areas for other uses has yet to take place, the Council has compensated for their loss by identifying areas of land for new employment sites. This is expanded upon below.

### **New Employment Land**

11.25 A number of additional employment sites were also allocated in 2014, upon the adoption of the Allocations Plan and the JAAP.

11.26 These additional sites were allocated to help meet additional employment needs, as well as to off-set the impact of the proposed re-development of sites listed under Paragraph 11.11.

11.27 These new areas of land are:

- Michelins Farm, Rayleigh (now known as Arterial Park)
- Land south of Great Wakering
- Land to the north of Aviation Way Industrial Estate, Rochford (now known as Airport Business Park)

### **Employment Densities**

11.28 The East of England Plan was revoked on 3 January 2013. Previous monitoring reports produced by the Council relied on the average employment densities set out in the East of England Employment Land Review Guidance (October 2007) produced by Roger Tym & Partners on behalf of the East of England Development Agency (EEDA), the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) and the Government Office for the East of England (Go-East).

11.29 Rochford District Council will now use the average employment densities set out in the Employment Densities Guide (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition) 2015 produced by the Homes and Communities Agency as the basis for its default assumptions regarding employment densities in the District. These default assumptions are shown in Table 11.1 below.

**Table 11.1 – Average Employment Densities Default Assumptions**

Land Use	Square Metres per Worker
Offices	11
Industrial	41.5
Warehouse and Distribution	80.7
Retail	41.7

Source: Homes and Communities Agency Employment Densities Guide (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition) 2015

### **Employment Land and Floorspace**

11.30 Table 11.2 below shows the net quantity of floorspace for employment uses completed between April 2021 and March 2022.

11.31 For the purposes of Table 11.2, employment uses are taken to mean any use falling within the traditional use classes:

- Class B1 – light industrial and offices
- Class B2 – general industrial
- Class B8 – storage and distribution

11.32 Whilst other uses, such as retail, financial and professional services, also create jobs, they will be considered separately within the Retail and Town Centres chapter.

11.33 Table 11.2 demonstrates that the District experienced a net loss in the amount of floorspace dedicated to Classes B1 and B2 in the monitoring period. In particular, a significant amount of B2 floorspace was lost on allocated employment sites, whilst a modest amount of B1 floorspace was lost within town centres.

11.34 By comparison, the District experienced a significant increase in the amount of floorspace dedicated to Class B8, with the majority of this floorspace being created in allocated employment sites.

11.35 It is recognised that changes to employment floorspace within the monitoring period does not tell the full picture. It may be possible for employment floorspace to be created and lost without needing planning permission. These changes to floorspace would not be recorded within these figures.

11.36 Furthermore, it is recognised that significant progress was made towards the delivery of new employment floorspace at Airport Business Park and Arterial Park within the monitoring period. As a result, it is expected that the amount of employment floorspace created will be significantly greater in the next monitoring period.

11.37 Table 11.3 sets out an indicative estimate of the potential number of jobs that could be created or lost by the employment space change in the monitoring period (based on

floorspace). In calculating the potential numbers of jobs, the default assumptions in the Employment Densities Guide (3rd Edition) 2015 have been used. These figures suggest a modest loss of around 8 jobs, however it must be recognised that wider changes to working patterns, including a greater move towards working from home, limits the usefulness of these figures.

**Table 11.2 – Changes to Employment Floor Space (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8), 2021-22**

Location	B1 floorspace completed (net), 2021-22 (m <sup>2</sup> )	B2 floorspace completed (net), 2021-22 (m <sup>2</sup> )	B8 floorspace completed (net), 2021-22 (m <sup>2</sup> )	Employment Uses Completed (net), 2021-22 (m <sup>2</sup> )
Allocated employment land	153	-1393	3393	2272
Within urban area (incl. town centres)	-391	0	0	-391
Outside urban area	0	0	459	459
<b>Total</b>	<b>-238</b>	<b>-1393</b>	<b>3852</b>	<b>2,221</b>

**Table 11.3 – Potential number of jobs created or loss through changes to employment floorspace, 2021-22**

	B1 (now Class E): Offices and Light Industrial	B2: General Industry	B8: Warehouse and Distribution	Totals
Floorspace completed (net), 2021-22 (m <sup>2</sup> )	-238	-1393	3852	<b>2,352</b>
Average Employment Density	11	41.5	80.7	<b>N/A</b>
Potential number of jobs created (net)	-22	-34	48	<b>-8</b>

## Available Employment Land

- 11.38 Policy ED4 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's approach to the allocation of new employment land in the District. The policy sets the general strategy for the allocation of sites to the west of Rayleigh, north of London Southend Airport and south of Great Wakering in the 2014 Allocations Plan and 2014 JAAP.
- 11.39 The Allocations Plan was adopted on 25 February 2014; a site to the west of Rayleigh and a site to the south of Great Wakering have been allocated as new employment sites. In addition, the JAAP which was adopted on 16 December 2014 identifies new employment land to the north of London Southend Airport.
- 11.40 The Council, in partnership with neighbouring Councils in South Essex, commissioned GVA to undertake an Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) for South Essex. The purpose of the South Essex EDNA (2017) is to assess the economic picture across South Essex, providing an evidenced, guidance-compliant analysis of the economic and employment land opportunities and challenges for both Rochford, and the wider South Essex area, and establishing a strategic, multi-authority strategy for realising the area's economic opportunity. It included an analysis of both the existing quantity of employment land and future employment needs.
- 11.41 A further EDNA for the Rochford District has been commissioned with work commencing during 2022 to provide a more up to date evidence, contributing to informing the new emerging Local Plan.
- 11.42 Tables 11.4 and 11.5 provide a statistical summary of the quantity of the office and industrial stock within the District, as set out in the South Essex EDNA 2017. These statistics, whilst now likely out of date, show that the proportion of available units to total units, asking rents and vacancy trends are generally in line with South Essex averages.

**Table 11.4 – Office Stock (Use Class B1a (now E) Summary Statistics, South Essex EDNA 2017**

	<b>Rochford</b>	<b>South Essex</b>
<b>No. of Units (Total)</b>	73	536
<b>Of Which Available</b>	7	53
<b>Total Floorspace (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	37694	614594
<b>Of Which Available (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	1330	26138
<b>Asking Rent (£ pm<sup>2</sup>, 5 yr. average)</b>	102	105
<b>Vacancy Rate (% , 5 yr. average)</b>	5	4.6
<b>Months on Market (5 yr. average)</b>	12.1	16.9

**Table 11.5 – Industrial Stock Summary Statistics (Use Classes B1 (except B1a), B2 (now E) and B8), South Essex EDNA 2017**

	<b>Rochford</b>	<b>South Essex</b>
<b>No. of Units (Total)</b>	90	911
<b>Of Which Available</b>	12	122
<b>Total Floorspace (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	108364	2281234
<b>Of Which Available (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	7089	1093364
<b>Asking Rent (£ pm<sup>2</sup>, 5 yr. average)</b>	49	59
<b>Vacancy Rate (% , 5 yr. average)</b>	6.4	5.8
<b>Months on Market (5 yr. average)</b>	12.4	15.8

## 12 Retail and Town Centres

### Town Centres

- 12.1 Policy RTC1 of the Core Strategy broadly supports the enhancement and improvement of Rochford, Hockley, and Rayleigh town centres.
- 12.2 The success of this policy will be indicated by a high proportion of retail uses (e.g. shops) and new retail development being located in town centres.
- 12.3 Rochford District has three main town centres, as identified in the Core Strategy.
- 12.4 Rayleigh is the only settlement in the District classified as a principal town centre, whilst Hockley and Rochford are classed as smaller town centres which cater for more local needs.
- 12.5 The Council, in partnership with neighbouring authorities across South Essex, commissioned Peter Brett Associates to produce the South Essex Retail Study (2018).
- 12.6 The purpose of the Retail Study was to provide an up-to-date source of evidence on retail and leisure trends both in Rochford, and across the wider South Essex sub-region. The study estimated the quantity and best location for new retail floorspace that should be provided in the future. An interim ‘topic paper’ was produced in November 2017, and the final report was noted by the Council in July 2018.
- 12.7 The South Essex Retail Study uses the Venuescore ranking system to compare the UK’s top retail destinations including town centres, malls, retail warehouses parks and factory outlet centres.
- 12.8 Within Rochford District, Rayleigh, Rochford and Southend Airport Retail Park have been ranked by Venuescore. A comparison of these destinations with other town centres and retail outlets in the sub-region is provided at Table 12.1 below.
- 12.9 Each destination in the table below receives a score based on the number of multiple retailers present. These are shops and brands that have stores across the country, as opposed to independent shops which may only have one or a few branches. The score attached to each retailer is weighted depending on their overall impact on shopping patterns.
- 12.10 Rayleigh is ranked 716<sup>th</sup> in the country by Venuescore and is described as a District-grade retail centre. Rochford and Hockley are much smaller town centres that serve more localised catchment areas than Rayleigh; Rochford is ranked 1709<sup>th</sup> by Venuescore while Hockley is currently unranked due to its comparatively small catchment and offer. The table below highlights the ranking of District and other local town centres.



**Table 12.1 – Ranking of District and other Local Centres  
(South Essex Retail Study 2018)**

Centre	Market position	Location Grade	Venuescore Rank
intu Lakeside Shopping Centre	Upper Middle	Major Regional	50
Westfield Stratford	Upper Middle	Sub-Regional	30
Chelmsford	Middle	Regional	67
Southend-on-Sea	Middle	Regional	88
Basildon	Lower Middle	Regional	97
Grays	Lower Middle	Major District	547
Billericay	Lower Middle	District	629
<b>Rayleigh</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>716</b>
Canvey Island	Lower Middle	District	943
<b>Airport Retail Park, Rochford</b>	-	-	<b>1,709</b>
<b>Rochford</b>	-	-	<b>2,577</b>

- 12.11 The South Essex Retail Study 2018 also provided a source of both qualitative and quantitative information about retail trends and made recommendations for how both retail and leisure development should be planned for the future both locally and across South Essex. The final report was noted by the Council in July 2018.
- 12.12 It is recognised that the last few years have been challenging for retail and town centres, particularly in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic and enforced period of closures. These challenges are likely to have accelerated long-term changes to the role of town centres. As a result, an update to the Retail Study was commissioned in early 2022. This update will provide an updated picture of retail and shopping trends in the area, including the quantity of new retail floorspace needed in the future.
- 12.13 Policy RTC2 of the Core Strategy deals with the Council’s aims regarding the sequential approach to retail development. In practical terms, this means the Council will look to make sure that new retail developments (e.g. shops) are located in the town centres of Rochford, Rayleigh, and Hockley first, and only located outside of town centres where this is not possible. The success of this policy will be indicated by a high proportion of retail uses and new retail development being located in town centres.

### **Changes to the Use Classes Order**

- 12.14 Buildings and land are categorised based on what they are allowed to be used for. These categories are known as “classes”.
- 12.15 New permitted development rights came into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2020 through The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020 which made changes to the long-established Use Classes Order.
- 12.16 The Regulations introduce three new use classes:
- **Class E:** (Commercial, business and service) – including retail, restaurant, office, financial/professional services, indoor sports, medical and nursery uses along with “any other services which it is appropriate to provide in a commercial, business or service locality”.
  - **Class F.1:** (Learning and non-residential institutions)- including non-residential educational uses, and use as a museum, art gallery, library, public hall, religious institution, or law court.
  - **Class F.2:** (Local community) – including use as a shop of no more than 280 sqm mostly selling essential goods, including food and at least 1km from another similar shop, and use as a community hall, area for outdoor sport, swimming pool or skating rink.
- 12.17 This has meant that Parts A and D of the original schedule to the Use Classes Order have been deleted, with the old Use Classes A1 (shops), A2 (professional services), A3 (cafes and restaurants) all subsumed into a single new Use Class E along with Class B1 (offices and light industry). A building already within a Class E use does not require planning permission to change to another use within Class E.
- 12.18 In practical terms, the changes mean that any building in a Class E use (which now includes shops, professional services, cafes, restaurants, offices, light industry and some other ‘town centre’ uses) can change freely to any other use within that list without planning permission. This creates flexibility which means that vacant town centre buildings should be easier to fill as landlords will not need to get permission from the Council to change use, however this also creates a challenge for councils looking to make sure town centres prioritise shops, as landlords no longer need their permission to change shops into other uses, for example a café or office.
- 12.19 This new flexibility will apply both to high streets and all town centre uses located outside of centres.
- 12.20 Some other uses common in town centres including bars, pubs and takeaways have now all become “sui generis” uses. These are uses that are not within any class. Planning permission will always be required to convert a building into a sui generis use.

**Retail (A1 of former Use Class Order)**

- 12.21 To monitor the performance of Policy RTC2, Table 1.2 below sets out the net change to retail (former Class A1) floorspace between April 2021 and March 2022.
- 12.22 For the purposes of Table 1.2, ‘town centre’ is taken to mean the areas covered by the Rochford, Rayleigh, and Hockley Area Action Plans, respectively.
- 12.23 In light of the changes to the Use Classes Order discussed above, it is important to recognise that not all changes of use to, or from, a retail use require a formal planning permission. Some caution should therefore be applied to the figures reported below.
- 12.24 Table 12.2 shows that there was a net increase in retail floorspace of 954m<sup>2</sup> between April 2021 and March 2022. This increase consisted of extensions to three separate garden centres which is reflected in the fact that 100% of this new floorspace was located outside of town centres.

**Table 12.2 – Retail floorspace permissioned (net), April 2021 – March 2022**

Location	Retail Floorspace Completed (net) 2021-22 (m <sup>2</sup> )	Of which on Previously Developed Land (m <sup>2</sup> /%)
Town centre	0	0
Out of centre	954	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>954</b>	<b>100</b>

**Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontage Areas**

- 12.25 There are three Town Centres in the District: Rayleigh, Rochford, and Hockley. Rayleigh provides the most comprehensive range of facilities and is defined as a principal town centre in the local development plan. Hockley and Rochford are classed as smaller centres in the District.
- 12.26 The Core Strategy sets the requirement that the Council produce Area Action Plans for each of the three centres in the District. The three Area Action Plans for the town centres have been adopted and form part of the local development plan. They include policies aimed at retaining suitable levels of A1(now Class E) retail uses within the primary and secondary shopping frontages of the District’s main centres.
- 12.27 In assessing the retail frontage within these areas, however, it is important to note that town centres are dynamic environments and that the right balance between retail and non-retail uses will shift as consumer preferences and markets change. As the Core Strategy makes clear it is appropriate to seek to maintain retail uses within identified primary and secondary shopping frontage areas, within town centres based on their existing characteristics.
- 12.28 The Council's commitment to maintaining the balance of non-retail uses permitted within core areas of town centres is set out in the Council's Area Action Plans. Each


area has a designated Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontage Area. However, this may no longer be possible with the changes in permitted development rights as set out above in paragraph 12.10

- 12.29 The last detailed use class surveys were undertaken in 2015. Statistics for the percentage of each town centre in retail use are provided below. Interim surveys were carried out in early 2020, and mapping of selected use classes is provided below.
- 12.30 A further use class survey was carried out in early spring 2022 to help inform the newly commissioned Retail Study update which will be reported upon in the following monitoring year.

### Rayleigh Town Centre

12.31 Policy RTC4 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council’s goals for Rayleigh town centre, including improved accessibility, a safe and high-quality environment, and a range of evening leisure use. With regards to primary and secondary shopping frontages the Rayleigh Centre Area Action Plan 2015 states that the Council will generally seek to ensure 75% of Rayleigh’s primary shopping frontage and 50% of its secondary shopping frontage is in retail (A1) use. At the time of the last detailed survey in 2015, retail (A1) use in the primary shopping frontage was at 63% with secondary shopping frontage at 48%.

**Figure 12.3 – Rayleigh Use Class Mapping, Selected Use Classes (2020)**






## Rochford Town Centre

12.32 Policy RTC5 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's goals for Rochford town centre; including an enhanced retail offer, a market square area that encourages visitors and improved accessibility. The Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan sets a general target that 65% of retail (A1) uses should be retained within the defined primary shopping frontage. This represents a lowering of the previous target of 75% but is considered appropriate in view of the emphasis being given to the suitability of appropriate levels of A3 and A4 uses within the primary frontage. The Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan also states that within the secondary shopping frontage proposals will be considered on their merit in accordance with the criteria set out under Policy 3. At the time of the last survey in 2015, retail (A1) use within the primary shopping frontage was at 69%.

**Figure 12.4 – Rochford Use Class Mapping, Selected Use Classes (2020)**




## Hockley Town Centre

12.33 Policy RTC6 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's goals for Hockley Centre, including redevelopment of Eldon Way/Foundry industrial estates, improved connectivity between retail focus and train station and a safe and high-quality environment. Whilst recognising the dynamic nature of centres the Hockley Centre Area Action Plan seeks to ensure 75% retail (A1) uses within the primary shopping frontage and 50% retail (A1) uses within the secondary shopping frontage. At the time

of the last survey in 2015, retail (A1) use within the primary shopping frontage was at 64%.

Figure 12.5 – Hockley Use Class Mapping, Selected Use Classes (2020)



### Covid-19 Pandemic

12.34 In light of the Covid-19 pandemic and lockdown restriction since March 2020, it is not yet clear at the time of compiling this report as to the impacts of the lockdowns on town centre retail provision. The pandemic is expected to accelerate ongoing trends of certain traditional town centre uses moving to online services, including banks and comparison retail. There is, however, some emerging evidence that local town centres such as those in the District have seen less of an impact in terms of footfall and vacancies than larger cities and shopping centres, reflecting both a preference to shop locally and the trend away from commuting towards home-working. A town centre survey was undertaken during early Spring 2022 to establish the impacts and vacancy rates to support a future retail study update and will be reported upon in the following monitoring year.

**Financial and Professional Services (A2 / E of Use Class Order)**

- 12.35 Table 12.6 below sets out the net change to financial and professional services (Class A2/E) floorspace between April 2021 and March 2022.
- 12.36 As not all changes of use to, or from, a financial or professional service use require a formal planning permission, the figures contained within Table 1.5 should only be considered an estimation.
- 12.37 Table 12.6 shows that there was no change to financial and professional service floorspace over the monitoring period.

**Table 12.6 – Financial and Professional services floorspace permissioned (net), April 2021 – March 2022**

Location	Financial and Professional Services floorspace completed (net), 2021-22 (m <sup>2</sup> )
Town centre	0
Out of centre	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>

**Offices (B1a / E of Use Class Order)**

- 12.38 Table 12.7 below sets out the net change to office (Class B1a / E) floorspace between April 2021 and March 2022. For the purposes of Table 12.7, ‘town centre’ is taken to mean the areas covered by the Rochford, Rayleigh, and Hockley Area Action Plans, respectively.
- 12.39 As not all changes of use to, or from, an office use require formal planning permission, the figures contained within Table 12.7 should only be considered an estimation.

**Table 12.7 – Office floorspace permissioned (net), April 2021 – March 2022**

Location	Office floorspace completed (net), 2021-22 (m <sup>2</sup> )
Town centre	-391
Out of centre	153
<b>Total</b>	<b>-238</b>



## 13 Duty to Co-operate

### Statutory Requirements

- 13.1 The Localism Act 2011 requires local planning authorities (LPAs) to co-operate with each other, and with other public sector bodies, to address strategic planning issues within their area.
- 13.2 The Localism Act specifically requires LPAs to “engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis” on strategic planning matters and consider joint approaches to plan-making where appropriate.
- 13.3 This ‘Duty to Co-operate’ came into force on 15 November 2011.
- 13.4 The NPPF requires LPAs to identify ‘strategic priorities’ for the area within their respective local plans and include strategic policies which aim to deliver these priorities.
- 13.5 The Duty to Co-operate is likely to be most important when addressing these strategic priorities on matters such as:
- How new homes and jobs will be provided
  - How new retail, leisure, and other commercial spaces will be provided
  - How infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste, utilities, flood risk and coastal change management, mineral extraction and energy generation (including heat) will be provided
  - How health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities will be provided; and
  - How climate change will be mitigated and adapted and how the natural and historic environment, including landscapes, will be conserved and protected.
- 13.6 The NPPF states that local planning authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively co-operated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their Local Plans are submitted for examination.
- 13.7 The Duty to Co-operate is a fundamental component of the soundness testing which forms part of the Independent Examination process for a local plan.
- 13.8 Regulations<sup>15</sup> require each local planning authority’s Authority Monitoring Report to provides details of what action has been taken during the monitoring period pursuant to satisfying the Duty to Co-operate.

---


<sup>15</sup> The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) England Regulations 2012



**Summary of Actions Taken under the Duty to Co-operate (2021-22)**

- 13.9 Rochford District sits within the Thames Gateway South Essex priority area for regeneration, and has strong infrastructure, commercial and employment links to its neighbouring authorities within the South Essex housing market area.
- 13.10 Prior to and throughout the monitoring period, Rochford District Council has sought to constructively, actively and on an on-going basis co-operate with other local authorities and public bodies on strategic planning matters. Some of the mechanisms through which such co-operation has occurred include:
- The preparation of joint evidence or studies
  - Attendance and participation at regular meetings, forums and workshops on strategic planning matters; and
  - Regular consultation and engagement with other authorities on development plan drafts and larger scale planning applications.

13.11 The map below shows Rochford District within the context of the Thames Gateway area.



13.12 Set out below are a list of the measures that Rochford District Council has taken, enabling commercial development coming forward over the period 2021-22 pursuant to discharging its Duty to Co-operate.

### **South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP)**

- 13.13 SELEP is the largest local enterprise partnership outside London and brings together leads from business, education, and local government across the four federated areas of Kent and Medway, East Sussex, South Essex and Greater Essex. SELEP aims to create an enterprising economy by exploring opportunities for and addressing barriers to growth.
- 13.14 Throughout the monitoring period, Rochford District Council has been an active member of SELEP and officers regularly attend its meetings. To date, SELEP has provided significant financial contributions to help fund specific ambitious projects in and around the District, such as:
- Part funding the costs of setting up a new high-tech business park to the north-west of London Southend Airport incorporating a range of industrial properties which are now coming forward, including a speculative development of 12 'grow-on-space' units. 'The Launchpad', a new innovation facility hub for start-ups and SMEs, also funded by SELEP which is also making significant progress this reporting year.
  - Part funding improvement schemes to the A127 including the A127/A130 'Fairglen' interchange
  - Enabling a share of the Government's new Getting Building Fund as an economic response to the Covid-19 Crisis (£85 million) to deliver a new cycle network infrastructure in Essex, extension of full-fibre rollout in Essex to reach rural and hard to reach premises, and a contribution of £713,000 to support the Rocheway residential development inclusive of an independent living (Extra Care) complex for older people
  - Enabling a share of the Government's Getting Building Fund and Growing Places Fund to kick start the development and re-use of vacant commercial spaces across South Essex through the 'No Use Empty' scheme. The scheme provides 0% secured loans to those looking to bring empty buildings back into use.

### **Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA) and the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan**

- 13.15 Rochford District Council, together with Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, Castle Point Borough Council, Basildon Borough Council, Thurrock Council and Essex County Council signed a formal Memorandum of Understanding on 22 March 2017.
- 13.16 This Memorandum sets out how these councils will work together on cross-boundary planning issues and identified key outputs that this co-operation is expected to deliver. These outputs include:
- The preparation of joint evidence base documents.

- The preparation of a joint Strategic Planning Framework.
- The preparation of a joint Co-operation Monitoring Report.
- The preparation of a joint Statement of Co-operation; and
- Further agreements, if and when appropriate.

13.17 A further Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the Council in February 2018, to which Basildon, Brentwood, Castle Point, Essex County, Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock Councils were also signatories. This second MoU set out an intention to establish an Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA).

13.18 ASELA is an organisation that provides place leadership for South Essex. Its aims are to:

- Provide place leadership.
- Open up spaces for housing, business, and leisure development by developing a spatial strategy.
- Transform transport connectivity.
- Support our 7 sectors of industrial opportunity.
- Shape local labour & skill markets.
- Create a fully digitally-enabled place.
- Secure a sustainable energy supply.
- Influence and secure funding for necessary strategic infrastructure.
- Enhance health and social care through co-ordinated planning; and
- Work with and provide a voice for South Essex to the Thames Estuary 2050 Growth Commission and Commissioners.

13.19 Over the monitoring period, the Council, as part of ASELA, has supported the development of multiple workstreams and projects, including those on place, infrastructure, and the economy. Support for these workstreams has included financial and resource support to enable the development of key technical documents and strategies.

13.20 As part of this process, the South Essex authorities are committed to the preparation of a joint planning framework to help implement their vision for South Essex. The framework will provide a high-level strategy and address key cross-boundary opportunities and challenges. It will not replace or bind local plans but rather provide a means to guide local policies so that they take advantage of joint opportunities.

- 13.21 Over the monitoring period, the Council has supported the preparation of the South Essex JSP in a number of ways, including supporting the development of key technical evidence base documents and drafting of the core document.
- 13.22 Officers from the Council attend weekly South Essex Joint Officers Group meetings where key strategic planning issues affecting South Essex are routinely discussed. This group also commissions and monitors progress on joint evidence documents and guides the preparation of the joint planning framework.
- 13.23 A list of the joint planning evidence documents that have been prepared and/or procured as part of ASELA include:
- South Essex Housing Needs Assessment (ongoing as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022)
  - South Essex Employment Land Availability Assessment (ongoing as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022)
  - Strategic Growth Locations Study
  - South Essex Tourism, Recreation and Leisure Strategy
  - South Essex Grow-on Space Study
  - South Essex Retail Study
  - South Essex Green and Blue Infrastructure Study
  - South Essex Strategic Infrastructure Position Statement A

### **Essex Coast RAMS Partnership**

- 13.24 In January 2018, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) relating to a proposed Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) was signed by the Council, along with Basildon Borough Council, Braintree District Council, Brentwood Borough Council, Castle Point Borough Council, Chelmsford City Council, Colchester Borough Council, Maldon District Council, Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, Tendring District Council and Thurrock Borough Council.
- 13.25 On Natural England advice, this MoU established the need to for a strategy that identified measures to protect habitats from harm caused by recreational activities along the coast. This harm could include damage to habitat or species from visitors and their pets.
- 13.26 The strategy considers the population growth that is likely to result from housing contained in Local Plans throughout the county of Essex. From this it assessed the likely harm to protected habitats that may result from higher visitor numbers to the coast as a result. The strategy then funds measures to mitigate and avoid this harm by charging a tariff on every new house built in the area.
- 13.27 The Council adopted the RAMS strategy in April 2019 and has been implementing the strategy in its development management decisions across the monitoring period.

- 13.28 The Council has supported the preparation of a supplementary planning document (SPD) that provides further information for applicants on how the RAMS affects them. This SPD offers practical guidance on what applicants need to do to comply with the RAMS. This SPD was published for public consultation in early 2020 and was adopted by the Council in October 2020.
- 13.29 The Essex authorities continue to work together to implement the RAMS. Chelmsford City Council act as the accountable body and employ a dedicated officer responsible for implementing the RAMS, alongside a team of coastal rangers. The Council contributes to steering groups and boards with responsibility for authorising spend and setting policy direction for the RAMS project.
- 13.30 The authorities have also launched a joint brand, BirdAware Essex Coast, which aims to promote the work of the partnership to the public. More information can be found at [www.birdaware.org/essex](http://www.birdaware.org/essex).
- 13.31 As of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022, the tariff is £137.71 per dwelling. This replaced the tariff of £127.30 which was in operation throughout the monitoring period, in line with an annual inflation review.

### **Essex Planning Officers Association (EPOA)**

- 13.32 EPOA represents 12 Local Planning Authorities in Essex, as well as two unitary authorities (Thurrock and Southend-on-Sea). Heads of planning departments from the authorities meet several times a year to discuss planning issues affecting the whole of Essex, and produce planning guidance documents, some of which are available to download from this website.
- 13.33 The Council routinely attends EPOA forums including a Chief Officers' Group, Planning Policy Forum and Development Management Forum. These groups meet quarterly and provide forums for relevant presentations, discussions and idea sharing around key planning issues. EPOA also leads on the preparation of some joint evidence or guidance for the collective Essex local authorities, including the Essex Design Guide.
- 13.34 More information on the work of EPOA is available at <https://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/EssexPlanningOfficersAssociation>

### **Housing Matters**

- 13.35 Rochford District Council falls within the South Essex Housing Market Area (HMA) and has strong links with its neighbouring authorities with respect to housing. Regular meetings are held by the Essex Planning Officers Association (EPOA), South Essex Joint Officers group and Essex Portfolio Holders group to discuss strategic housing issues and any issues that arise.
- 13.36 The Council also participates in a number of public-private partnerships relevant to housing delivery including the Essex Developers Group and South Essex Housing Group. The Essex Developers Group represents developers and local authorities, working to accelerate the delivery of housing, including affordable housing. The South Essex Housing Group supports the preparation, delivery and monitoring of local housing strategies across South Essex.

- 13.37 An update to the South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment, now known as the South Essex Housing Needs Assessment, was commenced during the monitoring period of 2021-22. This assessment is expected to be finalised before the end of the 2022-23 monitoring period.
- 13.38 Agreement was also reached within the monitoring period to commission an update to the Essex-wide Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessments that last took place in 2018. This update will be managed by EPOA on behalf of the Essex authorities.
- 13.39 Rochford District Council is an active member of the Essex Countywide Gypsy and Traveller Unit, along with other local authorities across Essex, and works with the unit to address unauthorised encampments and assess Gypsy and Traveller needs.

### **Economic Growth and Employment**

- 13.40 Rochford District Council has a smaller economy than its neighbouring authorities, and experiences high levels of out-commuting to neighbouring areas, particularly London, Basildon, and Southend-on-Sea.
- 13.41 Rochford District Council has worked collaboratively with Southend-on-Sea City Council to pursue opportunities to deliver new local job opportunities in the environs of London Southend Airport, within Rochford's local authority area. This collaborative work has included the preparation of the London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP) in 2014.
- 13.42 Opportunity South Essex (OSE) is a public-private partnership between the five South Essex councils, Essex County Council, and business representatives focusing on supporting and lobbying for improvements to support the growth of the South Essex economy. RDC is an active part of OSE through economic development managers' meetings which take place on a regular basis and through the OSE board. This group has overseen SELEP bids for funding and has been successful in securing monies to support the development of the new business park, improvements at the Fairglen Interchange on the A127, and more recently enabling a share of the Government's Getting Building and Growing Places funds.
- 13.43 Economic growth and employment is a strategic issue which forms part of discussions at the regular meetings of the South Essex Joint Officers Group. A key output from these groups has been the commissioning of strategic evidence to support spatial planning across the sub-region, including a South Essex Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) which was adopted into the Council's evidence base in July 2018.
- 13.44 A new EDNA has been commissioned during this monitoring year to support the new Local Plan. This study is expected to be published before the end of the 2022-23 monitoring period.

### **Green Belt**



- 13.45 The Metropolitan Green Belt extends eastwards from London and covers the majority of the land area of the five South Essex local authority areas. It was formally introduced in the area as part of the 1982 Essex Structure Plan.
- 13.46 The Metropolitan Green Belt forms a significant constraint to development, with the NPPF requiring development which would be materially harmful to its character and openness be refused, save for a few exceptions or if very special circumstances can be demonstrated.
- 13.47 The Council jointly commissioned a Green Belt Study with neighbouring Southend Borough Council in 2018. This Study was completed and published in February 2020.

### Climate Change and Environment

- 13.48 Throughout the monitoring period, joint work has taken place with the RSPB in relation to the management and progress of the Wallasea Island Nature Reserve.
- 13.49 A marine plan has been prepared by the Marine Management Organisation (MMO), with co-operation from Rochford District Council. The [South East Marine Plan](#) sets priorities and directions for future development within the plan area, informs sustainable use of marine resource and helps marine users understand the best locations for their activities.
- 13.50 Rochford District Council also co-operates with the other Essex coastal local authorities in relation to the Shoreline Management Plan for the area. This co-operation has included, within the monitoring period, attendance and participation at meetings and providing updates and revisions to identified objectives.
- 13.51 Within the monitoring period, the Council has collaborated with the Essex Climate Action Commission and with multiple workstreams organised by Essex County Council around climate change and related topics. This has included attendance and participation at workshops to improve the Essex local authorities' collective response to climate issues in their local plans, and by making contributions to technical evidence including a viability appraisal of carbon net zero standards in development. This activity is expected to continue and grow into the next monitoring period.
- 13.52 With relation to flooding, Rochford District Council has consulted Essex County Council and the Environment Agency on relevant development proposals throughout the monitoring period, as the lead local flood authorities. Where a response has been provided, this has been integrated into the final decision made.
- 13.53 A joint Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) has been prepared by the South Essex local authorities (excluding Thurrock) to take account of changes to the climate change allowances made by the Environment Agency. The SFRA was finalised and published in 2018.
- 13.54 The Council jointly commissioned a Landscape Character, Sensitivity and Capacity Study with neighbouring Southend Borough Council in 2018. This Study was finalised and published in 2020.

### Green Infrastructure

---

- 13.55 The Council, along with Basildon, Castle Point and Southend Councils, jointly commissioned Knight Kavanagh Page (PPG) to prepare a Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) and Built Facility Strategy (BFS). These strategies were finalised and published in April 2019.
- 13.56 A joint South Essex Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) study has also been commissioned to support the preparation of the South Essex JSP. This study was completed and published in 2020.
- 13.57 Officers from the Council sit on a Playing Pitch Implementation Group where operational and planning matters relating to playing pitches are discussed with Sport England, Active Essex, and representatives from the national governing bodies for sports.

### **Transport and Access**

- 13.58 The issue of strategic transport and infrastructure is a regular topic of discussion at the regular meetings of the South Essex Joint Officer Group, and bilateral meetings between the Council and Essex County Council, within the monitoring period.
- 13.59 Regular meetings are held between Rochford District Council, Essex County Council, Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, and staff at London Southend Airport as part of the Airport Transport Liaison Group. These meetings focus on finding ways to encourage passengers and manage sustainable use of the airport.
- 13.60 Officers and Members of the Council jointly support the A127 Economic Growth Corridor Taskforce which promotes the importance of the A127 arterial route and is exploring opportunities to deliver a long-term vision for the A127.

### **Health and Well-being**

- 13.61 Healthcare within Rochford District falls under the Castle Point and Rochford Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The CCG was consulted on all major planning applications within the monitoring period, to ensure any healthcare contributions needed to mitigate development are identified. Rochford District Council has acted as the recipient for any healthcare contributions triggered within the monitoring period, on behalf of the NHS.
- 13.62 Rochford District Council sits as part of the CCG Strategic Estates Project Board, set up in 2016, and the South East Essex Estates Group. The purpose of these boards is that influence healthcare planning and improve future healthcare provision across the sub-region.
- 13.63 In July 2022, the Castle Point and Rochford CCG is expected to fold and be integrated into the new Mid and South Essex Integrated Care System. It is, however, expected that existing methods of collaboration will continue within the new system.

### **Communications Infrastructure**

- 13.64 Superfast Essex is part of the Superfast Britain Programme co-ordinated by Essex County Council. The programme is funded and part-delivered by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK), BT, Gigaclear and some local authorities.



- 13.65 The South Essex authorities have also been successful in delivering a full-fibre programme which has attracted around £7m in combined funding from the Government. This programme has provided high-speed full-fibre broadband to 129 public sector sites and has laid ‘spines’ across South Essex, including Rochford, to enable greater connectivity in the future. As at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022, it was estimated that over 200km of fibre had been laid in South Essex as a result of the programme.
- 13.66 Throughout the monitoring period, improvements to broadband connectivity have been made across the District as part of these programmes. It is expected that these improvements will continue throughout the next monitoring period.

### **Formal Consultations and Statements of Common Ground**

- 13.67 In the period 2021-22, Rochford District Council provided formal consultation responses to:
- [Southend-on-Sea City Council “Refining the Options” Local Plan Consultation – October 2021](#)
  - [Maldon District Council Issues and Options Local Plan Consultation – March 2022](#)

## 14 Planning Obligations

- 14.1 Policy CLT1 of the Rochford District Council Core Strategy 2011 sets out that the Council will require developers to enter into legal agreements in order to secure planning obligations to address specific issues relating to developments, including requisite on-site infrastructure and the provision of on-site affordable housing.
- 14.2 In addition, the Council will apply standard charges to developments to secure financial contributions towards off-site and strategic infrastructure required as a result of additional development.
- 14.3 Through the monitoring period, the Council has secured its planning obligations through legal agreements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 14.4 At the current time, Rochford District Council does not have in place a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Until such time that a charging schedule is in place, the Council will continue to secure most of its planning obligations through legal agreements.
- 14.5 The NPPF sets out the tests that should be met before a planning obligation can be requested from a developer; these ensure any obligations are:
- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
  - directly related to the development; and
  - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 14.6 Planning obligations secured through a legal (or Section 106) agreement may include the provision of affordable housing, open spaces or youth facilities, or financial contributions towards education, healthcare, or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity of the site.
- 14.7 Whether such a contribution is required, and the value of that contribution, is typically determined by the relevant authority, e.g., Rochford District Council, Essex County Council, NHS etc., and needs to consider the size and impact of the development being proposed.
- 14.8 Changes made to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations in 2019 introduced a requirement to publish Infrastructure Funding Statements and includes a list of information relating to the funding of infrastructure that local authorities should include in such statements.
- 14.9 For completeness and consistency, this document has been prepared both as part of the Council's Annual Monitoring Report and as a standalone document titled the Council's Infrastructure Funding Statement.
- 14.10 It should be noted that many planning obligations relate to 'county matters' including education, early years and childcare, sustainable transport and highways improvements. In these cases, Essex County Council's own Infrastructure Funding

Statement will provide an overview of the monetary and non-monetary planning obligations relating to such matters within Rochford District. These matters are not included within this Infrastructure Funding Statement but a link will be provided once available.

- 14.11 Furthermore, whilst the Council collects funds towards local healthcare services on behalf of the NHS, it does not itself manage how these funds are spent. Therefore, whilst these contributions will be included in the tables and figures within this section, these are only included on a factual basis and without comment.
- 14.12 All of the matters summarised below are set out in greater detail in the Council's Section 106 monitoring table which is included at Appendix C.
- 14.13 Please note, the table at Appendix C only includes those contributions which are payable to the Council, and therefore does not contain certain contributions, such as highways or education contributions which would be payable to Essex County Council.

#### **Monetary and Non-Monetary Planning Obligations Agreed in Monitoring Period**

- 14.14 Between April 2021 and March 2022, three new legal agreements were agreed in relation to approved housing developments within the District. A summary of the obligations due to the Council (including healthcare contributions) is provided in Table 14.1.
- 14.15 The total value of monetary planning obligations agreed in the year is up to £1,582,584.50. Additionally around 319 affordable homes were secured in Section 106 agreements within the monitoring period.

Table 14.1 – Summary of Planning Obligations Agreed in 2021-22

Development details	Summary of Obligations Agreed
<p><b>Land East of Ashingdon Road, Ashingdon</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £75,000 towards youth facility improvements</li> <li>• £67,560 towards a capital asset value for replacement trees</li> <li>• £75,000 towards replacement tree planting</li> <li>• £262,300 towards healthcare improvements in the vicinity</li> <li>• 232 affordable homes</li> <li>• Approximately £90,700 towards mitigation measures required under the Essex Coast RAMS scheme</li> </ul>
<p><b>Land North of London Road, Rayleigh (Uplift to 722 dwellings)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to £820,250.00 towards off-site 3G pitch provision in the local area</li> <li>• An additional £120,089 towards healthcare improvements in the vicinity</li> <li>• An additional £38,628 towards providing refuse bins</li> <li>• An additional 78 affordable homes</li> <li>• Approximately £30,000 towards mitigation measures required under the Essex Coast RAMS scheme</li> </ul>
<p><b>Land rear 3 to 45 Alexandra Road, Great Wakering</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 affordable homes</li> <li>• £3057.50 towards mitigation measures required under the Essex Coast RAMS scheme</li> </ul>

**Monetary and Non-Monetary Planning Obligations Received in Monitoring Period**

- 14.16 Between April 2021 and March 2022, £297,475.97 in monetary planning obligations were received by the Council as part of legal agreements.
- 14.17 In addition to this, a total of £13,641.38 was received in the monitoring period outside a Section 106 Agreement from various planning applications relating to the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance and Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) tariff.
- 14.18 For the avoidance of doubt, miscellaneous costs mentioned in legal agreements, including how the developer covers the Council’s legal and monitoring costs, are not included for the purposes of this Statement.

**Table 14.2 – Summary of Planning Obligations Received in 2021-22**

Development details	Contributions Received
Lower Road, Windermere Avenues and Malyons Lane, Hullbridge	A combined £250,164.97 towards construction of a multi-use games area OR skate park within the surrounding area, AND improvements to sports facilities in the area by improving drainage at Pooles Lane Playing Fields
Land West of Little Wakering Road, Little Wakering	£47,311 towards healthcare facility improvements in the surrounding area

**Monetary Planning Obligations Allocated in Monitoring Period**

- 14.19 The Planning Practice Guidance defines the ‘allocation’ of a planning obligation as a decision to commit funds to a particular item of infrastructure or project. However, when planning obligations are included in legal agreements there will be details and clauses set out relating to how a certain obligation can be used. In some cases, these details and clauses can be relatively specific and, in being so, effectively ‘allocate’ the funds.
- 14.20 For the purposes of this statement, the total value of planning obligations allocated in the monitoring period is recorded as £0.
- 14.21 However, in the interests of transparency, the Council has included a comprehensive Section 106 monitoring spreadsheet at Appendix C which includes an up to date position on the planning obligations required by active legal agreements, and the clauses and terms which apply to each.

**Monetary Planning Obligations Spent in Monitoring Period**

14.22 The Council did not spend or release to the NHS any of the planning obligations it held within the monitoring period.

14.23 In the interests of transparency, the Council has included a comprehensive Section 106 monitoring spreadsheet at Appendix C which includes an up to date position on the planning obligations required by active legal agreements, and timescales for their expenditure.

**Monetary Planning Obligations Received and Not Spent**

14.24 As at 1 April 2022, the Council held a total of £1,204,102.90 in planning obligations that have not yet been spent or released to the NHS (in the case of healthcare contributions).

14.25 Table 14.3 overleaf provides details of the planning obligations that are recorded as having been received but not spent as at 1 April 2022.





Table 14.3 – Summary of Monetary Planning Obligations Held by the Council

Application Ref	Site	Developer / Applicant	£ amount	Detail	Date Received	Purpose	Date to be spent by
12/00363/FUL	190 London Road, Rayleigh	Bellway Homes Ltd	71,015.13	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of capital project.	Received 17/9/15	NHS - Money to be held by RDC until the PCT (or other NHS body) requests the contribution. The money will be held for 15 years by the Council.	10/08/2030
			20,000.00	Rochford District Council Community Facility contribution. To be used on the development of community facilities near the site.	Received 17/9/15	Community Facility near the London Rd Site - No timescales given on spend.	No End Date
12/00381/FUL	Land at Thorpe Road, Rectory Road and Clements Hall Way, Hawkwell	W H Royer Building Contractors	93,378.21	Rochford District Council Sports Facility contribution.	Received 15/10/14	Improvement of Sports Facilities in Hawkwell	No End Date

Application Ref	Site	Developer / Applicant	£ amount	Detail	Date Received	Purpose	Date to be spent by
12/00252/FUL	Star Lane Brickworks, Great Wakering	Taylor Wimpey UK Limited	28,400.00	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of capital project.	Received 11/11/16	NHS - Money to be held by RDC until the PCT (or other NHS body) requests the contribution. The money will be held for 10 years by the Council. Any unexpended funds after this anniversary will need to be paid back to Taylor Wimpey.	11/11/2026
			25,000.00	Community Facilities contribution to be paid to RDC on occupation of first dwelling. Money to be held for the provision of a multi-use games area in Gt Wakering. Any unexpanded balance to be returned to Taylor Wimpey after the 15th Anniversary of the payment.	Received 11/11/16	This is to be used for the provision of a multi use games area in Great Wakering. Any unexpended balance is to be returned to Taylor Wimpey on the 15th Anniversary of receipt.	11/11/2031

Application Ref	Site	Developer / Applicant	£ amount	Detail	Date Received	Purpose	Date to be spent by
10/00234/OUT	Land north of Hall Road, Rochford	Bellway Homes Ltd	383,689.00	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of capital project.	Received £213817.88 26/06/18 Received £213817.88 07/09/18	The contribution will be received upon occupancy of the 100th, 200th, 300th and 400th dwelling. It will only be used by the PCT or sucessor body.	26/06/2028
15/00075/FUL	90 Main Road, Hawkwell	Marden Homes Developments Limited	37,000.00	A sum of £37,000 to be paid to RDC towards it Affordable Housing Policy. This will be paid upon occupation of the first dwelling.	28/09/2018	Contribution will be used in accordance with the Councils Affordable Housing Policy as detailed in the core strategy.	28/09/2028
15/00599/FUL	Pond Chase Nursery, Hockley	Persimmon Homes Ltd	23,040.00	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of capital project.	01/05/2018	NHS - Money to be held by the Council until requested from NHS England. The funds will be used to improve the capacity of GP surgeries in the vicinity of the site to which residents of the site have reasonable	01/05/2028

Application Ref	Site	Developer / Applicant	£ amount	Detail	Date Received	Purpose	Date to be spent by
						access. Contribution will kept by the Council until the 10th Anniversary of receipt. The council will have to return any unspent cash at that point.	
15/00781/OUT	Airport Business Park, Southend	Henry Boot Developments	100,000.00	The owner will pay towards a cycleway between Cherry orchard Way and Hall Rd. The Owner, RDC and ECC shall use reasonable endeavours to negotiate with relevant landowners to deliver the cycleway improvements within 5 years	30/01/2017	Works must be implemented within 2 years of receipt of payment. The contribution is for works at the Butterly Bridge Bypass.	No date

Application Ref	Site	Developer / Applicant	£ amount	Detail	Date Received	Purpose	Date to be spent by
16/00733/FUL	Three Acres, Anchor Lane, Canewdon	Dove Jeffery Homes Limited / Anthony Stephen Hines	13,248.00	Contribution will be made towards expansion of local doctors surgeries in respect of increased demand.	16/06/2017	A contribution will be made upon 1st occupation for the provision of capital projects of NHS England specifically relating to the Greensward Surgery and/or Ashingdon Medical Centre.	16/06/2027
17/00582/FUL	Land north of Hall Road, Rochford	Bellway Homes Ltd	12,789.00	Healthcare contribution. Developer to pay RDC a Healthcare Uplift Contribution for the Primary Care Trust, which is to be paid prior to Occupation of the 501st Dwelling. To be paid plus or minus a sum to reflect increase or decrease of RPI	12/09/2018		No date



Application Ref	Site	Developer / Applicant	£ amount	Detail	Date Received	Purpose	Date to be spent by
17/00964/FUL	<b>Bullwood Hall, Hockley</b>	Sanctuary Affordable Housing Ltd	23,382.00	Paid prior to commencement. This will contribute towards the addition, or improvement at the General Practitioners Church View Surgery with predominantly serves the district of Hockley (including the Jones Family Practice). Contribution must be paid to NHS within 3 months of receipt	22/05/2019		22/05/2029
16/00668/OUT	<b>Land South of High Street, Great Wakering</b>	Swann Hill Homes	75,685.59	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of capital project.	10/01/2020	A contribution will be paid prior to occupation of first dwelling. The sum is a contribution towards healthcare provision within the vicinity of the site.	10/01/2030

Application Ref	Site	Developer / Applicant	£ amount	Detail	Date Received	Purpose	Date to be spent by
16/00731/OUT	Land West of Little Wakering Road, Little Wakering	Cogent Land	47,311.00	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of capital project.	01/03/2022	Prior to occupation of the first dwelling, a contribution will be received towards the provision of healthcare facilities so serve the area in which the site is located. The contribution must be used within 10 years of receipt. Any unspent element must be repaid to the owner upon written request within 50 days of the end of the 10 year period.	01/03/2032

Application Ref	Site	Developer / Applicant	£ amount	Detail	Date Received	Purpose	Date to be spent by
14/00813/OUT	Lower Road, Windermere Avenues and Malyons Lane, Hullbridge	Barratt David Wilson Homes	250,164.97	Improvement of sports facilities in Hullbridge by carrying out works to improve drainage at the Pooles Lane Playing Field - payment made before 50th dwelling  AND Construction of multi-use games area or a skate park on land within the vicinity of the development site if the proposals approved under clause 3.2 include funding such facilities on a site secured for such purpose instead of the owner constructing such a facility itself	01/10/2021		01/01/2031

**Appendix A – Dwelling Completions (net), 2021-22**

<b>APPLICATION REFERENCE(S)</b>	<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>DWELLING COMPLETIONS (2021-22)</b>
<b>16/00183/REM / 17/00582/FUL</b>	Land West Of Oak Road And North Of Hall Road, Rochford	Under Construction	<b>79 GF Ma</b>
<b>16/00668/OUT / 17/00862/REM / 16/00556/FUL</b>	Land Between Star Lane And Alexandra Road, South Of High Street, Great Wakering (Phase 2)	Under Construction	<b>73 BF Ma</b>
<b>14/00813/OUT</b>	Land Between Windmere Avenue And Lower Road Maylons Lane, Hullbridge	Under Construction	<b>132 GF Ma</b>
<b>15/00362/OUT / 20/00940/OUT</b>	Land North Of London Road And South Of Rawreth Lane And West Of Rawreth Industrial Estate Rawreth Lane Rayleigh	Under Construction	<b>61 GF Ma</b>
<b>19/01184/REM (PARCEL F)</b>	Land North Of London Road, West Of Rawreth Industrial Estate, Rawreth Lane, Rayleigh (Parcel F)	Under Construction	<b>51 GF Ma</b>
<b>20/00533/FUL</b>	24 Nelson Road, Rayleigh	Complete	<b>1 BF</b>
<b>19/00869/FUL</b>	Land Between 118 And 124 Stambridge Road, Rochford	Complete	<b>1 GF</b>
<b>18/01009/FUL</b>	Land Rear Of 1 To 8 Stile Lane, Rayleigh	Complete	<b>2 GF</b>
<b>19/01115/FUL</b>	12 Hamilton Gardens, Hockley	Complete	<b>1 BF</b>
<b>18/00088/FUL</b>	Land Rear Of The Anchor Inn, Anchor Lane, Canewdon	Complete	<b>1 BF</b>
<b>17/01240/FUL APPEAL</b>	Land Opposite 2 Goldsmith Drive, Rayleigh	Complete	<b>2 GF</b>
<b>19/00233/FUL</b>	87 Canewdon View Road, Ashingdon	Complete	<b>4 BF</b>
<b>20/00672/FUL</b>	12 Hedgehope Avenue, Rayleigh	Complete	<b>1 BF</b>
<b>17/00783/FUL</b>	Garage Block Between 28 AND 29 Althorne Way, Canewdon	Complete	<b>6 BF</b>
<b>20/01117/FUL</b>	19 White Hart Lane, Hawkwell	Complete	<b>1 BF</b>

Rochford District Council – AMR 2021-22

15/00795/OUT 19/00076/FUL	Avonside, Eastwood Rise, Eastwood	Complete	1 BF
17/00070/OUT 18/01026/REM	Land Between 7 And 13 Cagefield Road, Stambridge	Complete	3 GF
18/00560/FUL	156 Little Wakering Road, Little Wakering	Complete	1 BF
20/00658/FUL	Land Adjacent 191 Rectory Avenue, Ashingdon	Complete	1 BF
16/00632/FUL	Land North of Crouchmans Cottages, Poynters Lane, Great Wakering	Complete	1 BF
18/00944/FUL	24 Orchard Avenue, Hockley	Complete	1 BF
17/00083/FUL	Golf Driving Range Adjacent 33A Aldermans Hill, Hockley	Complete	3 BF
15/00165/FUL	464 Ashingdon Road, Ashingdon	Complete	1 BF
18/00686/FUL	171 High Street, Rayleigh	Complete	3 BF
20/00443/LDC	Lakeside Barn, Trenders Avenue, Rayleigh	Complete	1 BF
17/00102/FUL	Castle Point And Rochford Adult Community College, Rocheway, Rochford	Under Construction	5 BF
17/00964/FUL	Site Of Bullwood Hall, Bullwood Hall Lane, Hockley	Under Construction	17 BF
18/00088/FUL	Land Rear of 24 Hockley Road, Rayleigh	Complete	1 GF
20/00537/FUL	Land Rear of 89 Philbrick Crescent, Rayleigh	Complete	1 GF
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>456</b>

Appendix B – Housing Delivery Trajectory, 2022-2032

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year										
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32
<b>Sites with extant planning permissions</b>														
ROC/048/79 / 13/00407/FUL / 15/00149/NMA	Land Opposite Rayleigh Cemetery, Hockley Road, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Under Construction		5	5	5	8						
16/00183/REM / 17/00582/FUL	Land West Of Oak Road And North Of Hall Road, Rochford	Rochford	Under Construction	79	28									
16/00668/OUT / 17/00862/REM / 16/00556/FUL	Land Between Star Lane And Alexandra Road, South Of High Street, Great Wakering (Phase 1 completed)	Great Wakering	Under Construction (phase 2)	73	1									
14/00813/OUT	Land Between Windmere Avenue And Lower Road Maylons Lane, Hullbridge	Hullbridge	Under Construction	132	100	100	102							
15/00362/OUT / 20/00940/OUT	Land North Of London Road And South Of Rawreth Lane And West Of Rawreth Industrial Estate Rawreth Lane Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Under Construction	61	100	100	100	100	107					
19/01184/REM (Parcel F)	Land North Of London Road, West Of Rawreth Industrial Estate, Rawreth Lane, Rayleigh (Parcel F)	Rayleigh	Under Construction	51	30	36								



Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year										
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2033-32
17/01240/FUL Appeal	Land Opposite 2 Goldsmith Drive, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Complete	2										
16/00632/FUL	Land North of Crouchmans Cottages, Poynters Lane, Great Wakering	Great Wakering	Complete	1										
19/00076/FUL	Avonside, Eastwood Rise, Eastwood	Rayleigh	Complete	1										
15/00165/FUL	464 Ashingdon Road, Ashingdon	Ashingdon	Complete	1										
20/00443/LDC	Lakeside Barn, Trenders Avenue, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Complete	1										
17/00070/OUT, 18/01026/REM	Land Between 7 and 13 Cagefield Road Stambridge	Stambridge	Complete	3										
17/00489/DPDP3M / 17/00875/DPDP3M	Agricultural Building Adjacent Rose Wood Gardiners Lane Canewdon	Canewdon	Under Construction		1									
16/00731/OUT	Land West of Little Wakering Road and South of Barrow Hall Road Little Wakering	Great Wakering	Under Construction		50	70								
17/00102/FUL	Castle Point and Rochford Adult Community College Rocheway Rochford	Rochford	Under Construction	5	39	30								
18/00147/FUL	Land Adjacent 191 Rectory Avenue Rochford	Rochford	Complete	1										

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year										
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2033-32
18/01144/OUT	41 Crown Hill Rayleigh SS6 7HQ	Rayleigh	Not Started					4						
17/00750/FUL	Brandy Hole Yacht Club Kingsman Farm Road Hullbridge	Hullbridge	Not Started					7	7					
18/00398/FUL / 20/00774/FUL	Ricbra Lower Road Hockley	Hockley	Not Started				2	1						
18/00501/FUL	Land Rear of 49 Ambleside Gardens Harrison Gardens Hullbridge	Hullbridge	Under Construction			1								
18/00835/FUL	1 Malyons Lane Hullbridge Essex	Hullbridge	Under Construction			2	2	1						
17/00964/FUL	Site Of Bullwood Hall, Bullwood Hall Lane, Hockley	Hockley	Under Construction	17	15	20	20							
18/00686/FUL	171 High Street Rayleigh SS6 7QA	Rayleigh	Complete	3										
18/00944/FUL	24 Orchard Avenue Hockley SS5 5BE	Hockley	Complete	1										
18/00560/FUL	156 Little Wakering Road Little Wakering	Barling Magna	Complete	1										
18/00088/FUL	Land Rear of 24 Hockley Road Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Complete	1										
13/00117/FUL	Land Adjacent Silverbraes Brays Lane Rochford	Rochford	Under Construction		1									
18/00604/FUL	Land At 51-53 North St Rochford	Rochford	Not Started				1	1						
19/00131/FUL	151 Lower Road Hullbridge	Hullbridge	Under Construction		1									
19/00055/FUL	144 Greensward Lane Hockley	Hockley	Not Started				1							

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year										
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32
18/01009/FUL	Land Rear of 1 to 8 Stile Lane, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Complete	2										
18/01126/FUL	Ancillary Building Land Adjacent The Bungalow Hooley Drive, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started				1							
19/00233/FUL	87 Canewdon View Rd Ashingdon	Ashingdon	Complete	4										
17/00083/FUL 18/00201/DOMFP2	Golf Driving Range Adjacent 33A Aldermans Hill Hockley	Hockley	Complete	3										
19/00520/FUL	23 Park Gardens Hawkwell	Hawkwell	Not Started				1							
19/00019/LBC / 19/00012/FUL	22 South Street Rochford	Rochford	Not Started				1	1						
19/00041/FUL	Miranda The Esplanade Hullbridge	Hullbridge	Under Construction			1								
17/00431/OUT Refused / Appeal Allowed	Fairways Garden Centre Hullbridge Rd Rayleigh SS6 9QS	Rayleigh	Not Started					8	8					
19/00760/DPDP3M / 20/00988/FUL	La Vallee Farm Wadham Park Avenue Hockley	Hockley	Not Started				1	2						
19/00814/FUL /17/00454/DPDP3M 17/00689/LDC	Barn At Eastwood Nurseries Arterial Road	Rayleigh	Not Started				1							
19/00869/FUL	Land Between 118 And 124 Stambridge Road Rochford	Rochford	Complete	1										
17/01191/FUL	The Barn Trenders Avenue Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started				1	1						
18/00177/FUL	9 East Street Rochford SS4 1DB	Rochford	Not Started					3	3					

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year										
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2033-32
19/00318/FUL	Land Adjacent 34 Mount Crescent Hockley	Hockley	Not Started				1							
19/00792/FUL	1 Oak Walk Hockley SS5 5AR	Hockley	Not Started				1							
19/00796/LBC	33 North Street Rochford Essex	Rochford	Not Started				1							
17/00488/FUL	Land Rear of 12 To 26 Eastwood Road Rayleigh SS6 7JQ	Rayleigh	Under Construction			5	15	15	6					
19/01026/FUL	Stable Block The Dell Madrid Avenue Rayleigh SS6 9RJ	Rayleigh	Not Started				2	1						
09/00024/COU (Appeal Allowed)	33A Eastwood Road Rayleigh SS6 7JD	Rayleigh	Under Construction			3	6	3						
19/00277/DPDP3	Seven Oaks Cottage Napier Road Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started				1							
19/01059/FUL	35 London Hill Rayleigh SS6 7HW	Rayleigh	Not Started				1							
19/01085/FUL	Land Rear of The Anchor Inn Anchor Lane Canewdon	Canewdon	Complete	1										
19/01115/FUL	12 Hamilton Gardens Hockley SS5 5BU	Hockley	Complete	1										
19/01185/FUL	66 Lower Road Hullbridge SS5 6DF	Hullbridge	Not Started				3	3						
15/00736/FUL / 19/01172/FUL	Land Adjacent Grange Villa London Road Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Under Construction				7	20	20					
17/00783/FUL	Garage Block Between 28 And 29 Althorne Way Canewdon Essex	Canewdon	Complete	6										

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year										
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2033-32
18/00659/LBC 18/00658/FUL	Barns East of Rawreth Hall Rawreth Lane Rawreth	Rawreth	Not Started				3	3						
19/00482/FUL / 20/00747/FUL	Land Rear of 56 Kingswood Crescent Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Under Construction			1								
19/01146/FUL	The Old Bakehouse Back Lane Rochford	Rochford	Not Started					3	3					
20/00064/FUL / 21/00009/FUL	Land rear Of 18 Ashingdon Road Rochford	Rochford	Not Started				1							
15/00513/FUL 20/00544/NMA	Workshop North of the barn Trenders Avenue, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started				1							
20/00386/FUL	Site of 22 Main Road Hockley SS5 4QS	Hockley	Not Started				1	1						
17/00589/FUL	Little Stambridge Hall Little Stambridge Hall Lane Stambridge SS4 1EW	Stambridge	Under Construction			1								
17/00565/FUL (Appeal)	Land South of The Limes, Church Road, Hockley (adjacent The Limes, Church Road)	Hockley	Under Construction			1	1							
20/00533/FUL	24 Nelson Road Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Complete	1										
17/01198/FUL / 21/00822/FUL	Land South of Brick House Barn Fambridge Road South Fambridge Rochford	Rochford	Not Started				1	1						
20/00472/FUL	Hillgarth Woodside Road Hockley	Hockley	Under Construction			1								

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year											
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2033-32	
20/00537/FUL	Land Rear Of 89 Philbrick Crescent West Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started				1								
20/00614/FUL	Ancillary Building Rear Of 319 Rectory Road Hawkwell	Hawkwell	Not Started				1								
20/00701/FUL	84 Love Lane Rayleigh SS6 7DR	Rayleigh	Not Started				1								
20/00407/FUL	66 North Street Rochford SS4 1AD	Rochford	Under Construction				4	5							
20/00672/FUL	12 Hedgehope Avenue Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Complete	1											
20/00560/FUL	42-46 Eastwood Road Rayleigh SS6 7JQ	Rayleigh	Not Started				1	1							
20/00080/FUL	1 Daws Heath Road Rayleigh SS6 7QJ	Rayleigh	Not Started				1	1							
20/00452/FUL	Land rear Of 98 to 128 High Street Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started				5	5	14						
20/00722/FUL	Stables North Of Jakapeni Farm Burlington Gardens Hullbridge	Hullbridge	Not Started				1								
20/00752/FUL	Land Rear Of 8 St Johns Road Great Wakering	Great Wakering	Not Started				2	2							
20/01117/FUL	19 White Hart Lane, Hawkwell SS5 4DQ	Hawkwell	Complete	1											
20/01049/OUT	Land Adjacent 17 Bracken Dell SS6 8LP	Rayleigh	Not Started				1								
20/01045/FUL	129 Ferry Road, Hullbridge	Hullbridge	Not Started				1	2							
20/00974/FUL	Land rear of 46 Kingswood	Rayleigh	Not Started				1								

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year											
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2033-32	
	Crescent Rayleigh														
20/01137/DPDP3J	17-19 Main Road Hockley	Hockley	Not Started				1								
20/01179/FUL	60 Hockley Road, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Under Construction			1									
20/00566/FUL	82 Folley Lane, Hockley	Hockley	Not Started				1	2							
21/00064/DPDP3M	Biggins Farm Stambridge	Stambridge	Not Started				1								
20/00704/OUT	19 Rawreth Lane Rayleigh SS6 9PX	Rayleigh	Not Started				1								
21/00122/FUL	29 Britton Court Finchfield Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started				1								
21/00272/FUL	43 The Drive, Hullbridge, SS5 6LZ	Hullbridge	Not Started				1								
21/00316/DPDP3J	Farm Shop At Bolt Hall Farm, Lark Hill Road	Canewdon	Not Started				1								
21/00324/DPDP3J	9 Main Road, Hockley	Hockley	Not Started				1								
21/00370/OUT / 21/00794/REM	Land Adjacent 19 Parklands Avenue, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started				1								
21/00453/FUL	347 Eastwood Road, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started				1	1							
21/00485/FUL	Site of 34 To 38 Spa Road, Hockley	Hockley	Not Started				1	2							
20/00599/FUL	Shotgate Farm, London Road, Rawreth	Rawreth	Not Started				1	1							
21/00476/FUL	Wadham Park farm, Unit 2, Church Road, Hockley	Hockley	Under Construction		1										
20/01087/FUL	Creeksea Ferry Inn, Creeksea Ferry Road, Canewdon	Canewdon	Not Started			1									



Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year										
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2033-32
21/00312/FUL	Land Adjacent 29 Uplands Park Road, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started			1								
21/00487/FUL	39 Wyburns Avenue, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started			1								
21/00640/FUL	25 Spa Court, Spa Road, Hockley	Hockley	Not Started			1								
21/00670/DPDP3M	Beeches Farm, Arterial Road, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started			1								
21/00827/FUL	Mobile Home At Newlands Nursery, Chelmsford Road, Rawreth	Rawreth	Not Started			1								
21/00721/FUL	36 Larkfield Close, Rochford, SS4 1SS	Rochford	Not Started			1								
21/00845/DPDP3J	Site of 123 To 153 High Street, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started			5	5	6						
21/00883/FUL	4 Main Road, Hawkwell SS5 4JN	Hawkwell	Not Started			1								
17/00877/OUT APPEAL ALLOWED	Former Cherry Orchard Brickworks, Cherry Orchard Lane, Rochford SS4 1PP	Rochford	Not Started					63	64					
21/00738/FUL	106 Lower Road, Hullbridge, SS5 6DD	Hullbridge	Under Construction				4	5						
21/01250/FUL	Meadowbrook Farm, Ironwell Lane, Hawkwell	Hawkwell	Not Started				4	5						
18/01125/FUL	68-72 West Street, Rochford	Rochford	Under Construction					10	19					
21/00425/FUL	169 High Street, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Not Started			1								

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year											
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2033-32	
21/01251/FUL	7 Hawkwell park Drive, Hawkwell SS5 4HA	Hawkwell	Not Started			1	1								
21/01270/FUL	Land Adjacent Brayside, Brays Lane, Rochford	Rochford	Not Started			1									
20/00363/OUT APPEAL ALLOWED	Land East Of Ashingdon Road And North Of Rochford, Garden way, Rochford	Rochford	Not Started				100	100	100	100	100	100	62		
21/00986/FUL	32 Poplars Avenue, Hawkwell	Hawkwell	Not Started			1									
21/01326/FUL	1 Kendal Close, Hullbridge	Hullbridge	Not Started			1									
18/01064/FUL APPEAL ALLOWED	Land Rear Of 37 And 39 Downhall Road, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Under Construction			1	1								
20/00332/FUL	Land Opposite 92 To 102 Windermere Avenue, Hullbridge	Hullbridge	Not Started				5	5	7						
18/00282/FUL / 18/00283/LBC	19 South Street, Rochford	Rochford	Not Started				4	4							
21/01334/FUL	Pondside, Lark Hill Road, Canewdon	Canewdon	Under Construction			1									
21/00363/DOMBN1	Land Rear of 89 Philbrick Crescent, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Completed	1											
			<b>Total</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Resolution to Grant Planning Permission Subject to S106 Agreement</b>															
16/00899/FUL	Timber Grove London Road Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Approved subject to S106				13	35	35						

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year											
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2033-32	
18/01115/FUL	Land Rear of 3 to 45 Alexandra Road Great Wakering	Great Wakering	Approved subject to S106					15	10						
<b>Total</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Allocated sites without planning permission</b>															
Allocations Plan site BFR2	Eldon way / Foundry Industrial estate (minus element covered by 15/00144/OUT)	Hockley	Allocated site											40	40
Allocations Plan site BFR3	Stambridge Mills, Rochford	Rochford	Allocated site										50	48	
Allocations Plan BFR4	Rawreth Industrial Estate, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Allocated Site										70	70	82
<b>Total</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Sites without planning permission but considered deliverable or developable (Brownfield register, SHELAA etc.)</b>															
ROC019 / BF02	162-168 High Street Rayleigh	Rayleigh	Brownfield register / HELAA								10				
ROC020 / BF03	247 London Road Rayleigh SS6 9DW	Rayleigh	Brownfield register / HELAA								12				
CFS096	Former Rochford Police Station 43-45 South Street, Rochford	Rochford	Brownfield register / HELAA								15				

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year											
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2033-32	
CFS156	Lime Court and Poplar Court, Greensward Lane, Hockley, Essex, SS5 5HB & SS5 5JB	Hockley	HELAA								20				
CFS157	Sangster Court, Church Road, Rayleigh, Essex, SS6 8PZ	Rayleigh	HELAA								11				
BF05	Castle Road Recycling Centre, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	HELAA								11				
COL21	Council Offices, South Street, Rochford	Rochford	HELAA			10	10								
COL20	Civic Suite Hockley Road Rayleigh	Rayleigh	HELAA			6	6								
REF01	156 High Street, Rayleigh	Rayleigh	HELAA								6				
REF02	Site of 31 to 33 White Hart Lane, Hawkwell	Hawkwell	HELAA								9				
WD01	61 High Street Great Wakering	Great Wakering	HELAA								5				
WD03	Land opp 100 Windermere Avenue Hullbridge	Hullbridge	HELAA								15				
GF01	Land north west of Hockley Station	Hockley	HELAA								13				
<b>Total</b>				0	0	16	16	0	0	91	0	0	0	0	
<b>Windfall Allowance</b>				0	0	0	0	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	

Reference	Address	Settlement / Parish	Status	Year										
				2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32
<b>Cumulative Total</b>				456	372	384	470	502	448	236	145	265	225	127
Completions (2021-22)				456	Total 5 Year				2176	Total 10 Year				3174
					Local Housing Need With 5% Buffer				1890					
					Number of Years Supply				5.76					

Appendix C – Section 106 Monitoring Spreadsheet

<u>Parish / Town</u>	<u>Planning Application No.</u>	<u>Development Location</u>	<u>Developer / Owner</u>	<u>Date of Agreement</u>	<u>S106 Amount £</u>	<u>Purpose of Contribution</u>	<u>Date Contribution Received</u>	<u>Detail</u>	<u>Needs to be returned if not spent?</u>	<u>Date must be returned if not spent</u>	<u>Spent?</u>
Rayleigh	12/00363/FUL	190 London Road, Rayleigh	Bellway Homes Ltd	01/10/2012	71,015.13	Healthcare Facilities	17/09/2015	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf of NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of a capital project.	Yes	17/09/2030	No
					20,000.00	Community Facilities	17/09/2015	To fund community facility improvements near the application site	No	N/A	No
Hawkwell	12/00381/FUL	Land at Thorpe Road, Rectory Road and Clements Hall Way, Hawkwell.	W H Royer Building Contractors	17/12/2012	93,378.21	Sports Facilities	15/10/2014	Improvement of Sports Facilities in Hawkwell to be spent on at least two of the following:- 1. Levelling and improving the drainage of 2 football pitches at Clements Hall 2. Providing a new floor surface at the Clements Hall Sports Centre 3. Providing a 3G surface for the multi-use games area at Clements Hall.	No	N/A	No
Great Wakering	12/00252/FUL	Star Lane Brickworks, Star Lane, Great Wakering	Taylor Wimpey UK Limited	26/06/2015	28,400.00	Healthcare Facilities	11/11/2016	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf of NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of a capital project.	Yes	11/11/2026	No
					25,000.00	Community Facilities	11/11/2016	This is to be used for the provision of a multi use games area in Great Wakering.	Yes	11/11/2031	No
					19,488.00	Refuse Bins	11/11/2016	Contribution of £168 per dwelling for the provision of refuse bins.	Yes	11/11/2031	Yes
Great Wakering	16/00668/OUT	Land South of High Street, Great Wakering	Swann Hill Homes	26/07/2017	75,685.59	Healthcare Facilities	10/01/2020	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf of NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of a capital project.	Yes	10/01/2030	No

<u>Parish / Town</u>	<u>Planning Application No.</u>	<u>Development Location</u>	<u>Developer / Owner</u>	<u>Date of Agreement</u>	<u>S106 Amount £</u>	<u>Purpose of Contribution</u>	<u>Date Contribution Received</u>	<u>Detail</u>	<u>Needs to be returned if not spent?</u>	<u>Date must be returned if not spent</u>	<u>Spent?</u>
Rochford	10/00234/OUT	<b>Land North of Hall Road, Rochford</b>	Bellway Homes Ltd	01/07/2013	383,689.00	Healthcare Facilities	Received half on 26/06/2018 Received half on 07/09/2018	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf of NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of a capital project.	Yes	26/06/2028	No
					17,697.24	Air Quality Assessment	25/03/2021	To assess air quality at the Sutton Road / Southend Road (Anne Boleyn) junction	Yes	25/03/2031	No
Hawkwell	15/00075/FUL	<b>90 Main Rd, Hawkwell</b>	Marden Homes Developments Limited	28/08/2015	37,000.00	Off-site Affordable Housing contribution	28/09/2018	Contribution will be used in accordance with the Councils Affordable Housing Policy as detailed in the core strategy.	Yes	28/09/2028	No
					6,048.00	Refuse Bins	£1513.00 received on 31/07/2017 £2267.50 received on 11/09/2017 £2267.50 received on 30/11/2017	Contribution of £168 per dwelling for the provision of refuse bins	No	N/A	Yes
Hockley	15/00599/FUL	<b>Pond Chase Nursery, Folly Lane, Hockley</b>	Persimmon Homes Ltd	01/06/2016	23,040.00	Healthcare Facilities	01/05/2018	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf of NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of a capital project.	Yes	01/05/2028	No



<u>Parish / Town</u>	<u>Planning Application No.</u>	<u>Development Location</u>	<u>Developer / Owner</u>	<u>Date of Agreement</u>	<u>S106 Amount £</u>	<u>Purpose of Contribution</u>	<u>Date Contribution Received</u>	<u>Detail</u>	<u>Needs to be returned if not spent?</u>	<u>Date must be returned if not spent</u>	<u>Spent?</u>
Rayleigh	15/00362/OUT	Land North of London Road, Rayleigh	Countryside Properties	03/06/2016	84,000.00	Refuse bin collection		Contribution of £168 per dwelling for the provision of refuse bins	Yes	5 years from date received	No
					200,000.00	Off-site flooding contribution	Not yet received	<p>To fund off-site works to mitigate flood risk in the surrounding area.</p> <p>First payment (£50,000.00) can be requested any time up until the occupation of the 150<sup>th</sup> dwelling, assuming also that the outline proposals of a flood mitigation scheme using the funding has been identified and consented in principle.</p> <p>Second payment (£100,000) can be requested any time up until the occupation of the 150<sup>th</sup> dwelling, assuming also that detailed design and costings of the above scheme are available.</p> <p>Final payment (up to £50,000) can be requested any time between the occupation of the 200<sup>th</sup> and 250<sup>th</sup> dwellings, assuming also that construction has been awarded and all necessary consents have been obtained</p>	Yes	N/A - only payable upon achievement of milestones	N/A
					3,000.00	Rodent Control	Not yet received	Not guaranteed. Only payable should the Council have evidence of a causal link between groundworks and the presence of rodents at a dwelling within 50 metres of the development site	Yes	N/A - only payable upon achievement of milestones	N/A
					164,581.82	Healthcare Facilities	24/10/2022	Healthcare contribution received in lieu of healthcare land being required. Money received on behalf of NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of a capital project.	Yes	24/10/2027	24/10/2027

<u>Parish / Town</u>	<u>Planning Application No.</u>	<u>Development Location</u>	<u>Developer / Owner</u>	<u>Date of Agreement</u>	<u>S106 Amount £</u>	<u>Purpose of Contribution</u>	<u>Date Contribution Received</u>	<u>Detail</u>	<u>Needs to be returned if not spent?</u>	<u>Date must be returned if not spent</u>	<u>Spent?</u>
Rayleigh	20/00940/OUT	Land North of London Road, Rayleigh (cont.)	Countryside Properties	19/01/2022	820,250.00	Off-site 3G sports pitches	Not yet received	To be used to fund off-site 3G sports pitches in the surrounding area.  £50,000 can be requested up until 5 years from permission date. £361,740 can be requested after permissions secured. A further £361,740 can be requested once construction has commenced and a final £46,770 can be requested once completed	Yes	3 years from receipt of final payment	N/A
					38,628.00	Refuse bin collection	Not yet received	Additional contribution of £168 per dwelling for the provision of refuse bins to service uplift in number of dwellings	Yes	5 years from date received	N/A
					120,089.00	Healthcare Facilities	Not yet received	Additional healthcare contribution to service uplift in number of dwellings. Must be paid within one year of the healthcare contribution due on the original consent	Yes	10 years from receipt of payment	N/A
Rochford	15/00781/OUT	Land East of Rugby Club, Cherry Orchard Way (Airport Business Park)	Henry Boot Developments	06/12/2016	175,000.00	Access Improvements	19/11/2018	Towards access improvements to Cherry Orchard Country Park	Yes	19/11/2023	Yes
					100,000.00	Cycling Facilities	30/01/2017	The owner will pay towards a cycleway between Cherry orchard Way and Hall Rd. The Owner, RDC and ECC shall use reasonable endeavours to negotiate with relevant landowners to deliver the cycleway improvements within 5 years	Yes, although revised arrangement in place	30/01/2019	No

<u>Parish / Town</u>	<u>Planning Application No.</u>	<u>Development Location</u>	<u>Developer / Owner</u>	<u>Date of Agreement</u>	<u>S106 Amount £</u>	<u>Purpose of Contribution</u>	<u>Date Contribution Received</u>	<u>Detail</u>	<u>Needs to be returned if not spent?</u>	<u>Date must be returned if not spent</u>	<u>Spent?</u>
Hullbridge	14/00813/OUT	Land at Lower Road, Windermere Avenues and Malyons Lane, Hullbridge	Southern & Regional Developments Ltd(David Wilson Jones)	18/01/2017	70,000.00	Sports Facilities	01/10/2021	Improvement of sports facilities in Hullbridge by carrying out works to improve drainage at the Pooles Lane Playing Field - payment made before 50th dwelling	Yes	01/01/2031	No
					150,000.00	Youth Facilities	01/10/2021	Construction of multi-use games area or a skate park on land within the vicinity of the development site if the proposals approved under clause 3.2 include funding such facilities on a site secured for such purpose instead of the owner constructing such a facility itself	Yes	01/01/2031	No
					164,500.00	Healthcare Facilities	26/04/2022	Healthcare contribution. Money received on behalf of NHS England. Monies held in a designated account until an invoice is received for provision of a capital project.	Yes	26/04/2032	No
					100,000.00	Cycling Facilities	26/04/2022	Providing the proposed National Cycle Network Route 135 - not to permit occupation of the 100th dwelling before payment made	Yes	26/04/2032	No
Canewdon	16/00733/FUL	Three Acres, Anchor lane, Canewdon	Dove Jeffery Homes Limited / Anthony Stephen Hines	27/03/2017	13,248.00	Healthcare Facilities	16/06/2017	A contribution will be made upon 1st occupation for the provision of capital projects of NHS England specifically relating to the Greensward Surgery and/or Ashingdon Medical Centre.	Yes	16/06/2027	No
					5,880.00	Refuse bin collection	16/06/2017	Contribution of £168 per dwelling for the provision of refuse bins. Payment to be made prior to first occupation.	No	N/A	Yes

<u>Parish / Town</u>	<u>Planning Application No.</u>	<u>Development Location</u>	<u>Developer / Owner</u>	<u>Date of Agreement</u>	<u>S106 Amount £</u>	<u>Purpose of Contribution</u>	<u>Date Contribution Received</u>	<u>Detail</u>	<u>Needs to be returned if not spent?</u>	<u>Date must be returned if not spent</u>	<u>Spent?</u>
Little Wakering	16/00731/OUT	Land West of Little Wakering Road, Little Wakering	Cogent Land LLP	11/10/2017	47,311.00	Healthcare Facilities	01/03/2022	Towards the provision of healthcare facilities so serve the area in which the site is located	Yes	01/03/2032	No
Rayleigh	15/00736/FUL	Land Adjacent Grange Villa, London Road, Rayleigh	Silver City Estates Limited	11/08/2017	45,000.00	Community Facilities	Not yet received	A contribution of £45,000 is to be made towards the upgrade and overhaul of Little Wheatleys play Space. Contribution will be paid prior to the first dwelling being occupied.	No	N/A	N/A
Canewdon	17/00258/FUL	Birch Lodge	Birch Lodge Developments Ltd	26/07/2018	5,520.00	Healthcare Facilities	03/10/2019	A capital provision towards the healthcare facilities at either Greensward Surgery or the Ashingdon Medical Centre.	Yes	03/10/2029	No
Rochford	17/00582/FUL	Land North of Hall Road, Rochford (Additional 20 dwellings)	Bellway Homes Ltd	10/04/2018	12,789.00	Healthcare Facilities	12/09/2018	Developer to pay RDC a Healthcare Uplift Contribution for the Primary Care Trust, which is to be paid prior to Occupation of the 501st Dwelling. To be paid plus or minus a sum to reflect increase or decrease of RPI	Yes	12/09/2028	No
Hockley	17/00964/FUL	Bullwood Hall, Hockley	Sanctuary Affordable Housing LTD	21/12/2018	28,382.00	Healthcare Facilities	22/05/2019	Paid prior to commencement. This will contribute towards the addition, or improvement at the General Practitioners Church View Surgery with predominantly serves the district of Hockley (including the Jones Family Practice). Contribution must be paid to NHS within 3 months of receipt	Yes	22/05/2029	No

Parish / Town	Planning Application No.	Development Location	Developer / Owner	Date of Agreement	S106 Amount £	Purpose of Contribution	Date Contribution Received	Detail	Needs to be returned if not spent?	Date must be returned if not spent	Spent?
Rayleigh	17/00431/OUT	Fairways Garden Centre, Hullbridge Road, Rayleigh	Kent Property Investments LTD	12/08/2019	UP TO 663429	Off-site Affordable Housing contribution	Not yet received	Utilised towards the provision of off-site Affordable Housing - payments adjusted upwards only from the date of the deed (12/08/19) to the date of payment of the Infrastructure Contribution = A x B/C = D (A is the payment pursuant to the relevant clause/B is the figure shown in the BCIS index for the period immediately prior to the date of payment/C is the figure shown in the BCIS Index for the period immediately prior to the date of the agreement - D is the recalculated sum	No	N/A - only payable upon achievement of milestones	N/A
Rayleigh	17/00488/FUL	Land 12 to 26 Eastwood Road	Histonwood Limited	22/12/2020	UP TO 78,911.00	Off-site Affordable Housing contribution	Not yet received	If the overage value (profit) is over the overage trigger (surplus amount in the Development Account when compared with the Viability Appraisal), then the owner will pay the council under community and housing services the overage payment - capped at £78,911. If Value is less than trigger than no payment required	No	N/A - only payable upon achievement of milestones	N/A
Rochford	20/00363/OUT	Land East of Ashingdon Road, Ashingdon	Bloor Homes	02/02/2022	262,300.00	Healthcare Facilities	Not yet received	For the provision of capital projects to expand existing or provide new general practitioner medical surgeries to serve the development.	Yes	5 years from receipt	No
					75,000.00	Youth Facilities	Not yet received	To fund youth facility improvements in the surrounding area. Contribution due prior to occupation of 50th dwelling on the development	No	N/A	No
					67,560.00	Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT)	Not yet received	Contribution to mitigate loss of amenity trees	No	N/A	No
					75,000.00	Tree Contribution	Not yet received	To fund compensatory tree planting and purchasing of	No	N/A	No

<u>Parish / Town</u>	<u>Planning Application No.</u>	<u>Development Location</u>	<u>Developer / Owner</u>	<u>Date of Agreement</u>	<u>S106 Amount £</u>	<u>Purpose of Contribution</u>	<u>Date Contribution Received</u>	<u>Detail</u>	<u>Needs to be returned if not spent?</u>	<u>Date must be returned if not spent</u>	<u>Spent?</u>
								uprated compensatory tree planting stock			