

12 July 2005

**SOUTHEND ON SEA BOROUGH  
COUNCIL**

**FINAL DRAFT REPORT:  
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL  
OF THE PUBLIC  
PARTICIPATION CORE  
STRATEGY**

**BAKER**

---

ASSOCIATES

## **Contents**

---

Section 1:	Introduction	3
Section 2:	Content of the Sustainability Report	4
Section 3:	Overall Approach to the Sustainability Appraisal	4
Section 4:	Consultation	5
Section 5:	Other Documents and Objectives	6
Section 6:	Character of the Borough of Southend on Sea	10
Section 7:	Sustainability Framework and Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy	27
Section 8:	Consideration of Alternatives	28
Section 9:	Findings of the Sustainability Appraisal	32

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1:	Sustainability Framework	34
Appendix 2:	Appraisal of the Core Strategy Approaches	37

## 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This document reports on the sustainability appraisal (SA) of the Public Participation Core Strategy of the Southend on Sea Local Development Framework (LDF), and prepared at the request of the Southend on Sea Borough Council.
- 1.2 Sustainability appraisal is the process by which the influence that a land use or spatial plan (in this case the Local Development Framework) would have over development and change is assessed according to the likely contribution to the desirable environmental, economic and social objectives that are embraced by a concern to achieve greater sustainability.
- 1.3 A SA of the LDF is being carried out in order to fulfil the statutory requirement from the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The SA is being carried out in such a way as to meet the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive.
- 1.4 The SA of the LDF is being carried out as the LDF is prepared, and the process is being applied to each of the constituent Local Development Documents. The process to be followed in order to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive is set out in the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. The Regulations require the preparation of an environmental report on the LDF, and hence on each of its component Local Development Documents (LDDs), and this is required (at para. 12(2)) to:
- ‘identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of:*
- (a) implementing the plan or programme*
- (b) reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme.’*
- 1.5 This document, referred to hereafter as the SA report, is to accompany the Draft Core Strategy at its public participation stage. As work on the LDF continues, with the preparation of several LDDs and each of these going through several stages in their preparation, there will be several sustainability appraisal reports.
- 1.6 It is to be noted that the SA report is itself part of the consultation. The Council is seeking views on the Draft Core Strategy, and views are being sought too on the SA report. This is referred to in the Council’s questionnaire, though the questions that might be considered in responding to the consultation include:
- does the SA report deal with the right issues in ‘testing’ the core strategy?
  - is the SA report generally correct in its interpretation of the likely affects of implementing the Core Strategy as it is set out in the Draft LDD?

## **2 Content of the SA Report**

### 2.1 The SA report:

- provides further information on the approach that has been taken, including explanation of the relationship between what would be done as a SA and what is being done as part of the exercise to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive – section 3
- explains the role of the consultation bodies, as provided for in the Regulations – section 4
- identifies other strategies and plans that the LDF has to have regard to and draws on the objectives of these documents – section 5
- describes some of the main environmental, economic and social characteristics of the Borough that should influence what types of change the LDF sets out to deliver (the baseline) – section 6
- explains and presents the sustainability framework used in the SA – section 7
- considers how the Core Strategy deals with alternatives – as the Environmental Report for a SEA is required to do – section 8
- sets out some overall findings from the process – section 9.

2.2 It is intended that the report be published to accompany the Public Participation Draft Core Strategy.

## **3 Overall Approach to the Sustainability Appraisal**

3.1 The way that the SA of the LDF is undertaken has to be applicable to each part of the LDF and throughout the process of its preparation. Some aspects of the LDF will require more detailed assessment than is possible for the types of material contained within the Core Strategy, but the basic approach has to be demonstrably common.

3.2 The approach being taken, and being put in place by this first piece of work, is to carry out a sustainability appraisal in a way which addresses the requirements of the SEA Directive. The basic features of the approach are as follows:

- to draw upon other plans, strategies and information documents to identify objectives that the LDF needs to relate to, to identify environmental and other sustainability characteristics and issues, and to identify useful environmental information as the baseline

- to undertake a general SA including consideration of the likely effects on the environmental components of the sustainability agenda
- to report in more detail and when it is possible to do so, on those parts of the environmental agenda identified in the SEA Directive and Regulations, and which are either important in the Borough or likely to be much affected by the plan, or both
- to report on whether there could be different and better environmental implications if reasonable alternatives appropriate to the type of material dealt with by the particular LDD were pursued.

3.3 An important part of the approach being followed is the use of a ‘sustainability framework’ to assist in the comprehensive and systematic consideration of the parts of the plan in relation to what it means to promote more sustainable development, and this is further explained in section 7 of the report.

## **4 Consultation**

4.1 The LDF is being prepared by a process involving widespread consultation at successive stages of the work. The Council’s intention is that the consultation should be assisted by the SA, with reports published alongside each LDF document explaining the performance of the parts of the LDF in relation to the overall objective of promoting sustainable development. It is the intention too that the SA itself should be something on which participants in the consultation process are able to comment.

4.2 Insofar as the SA is being undertaken in a way which addresses the requirements of the SEA Directive, there is material in the Regulations setting out specific tasks that the consultation process must include to conform to the SEA Directive. The Regulation includes the statement that *‘when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information that must be included in the report, the responsible authority shall consult the consultation bodies.’*

4.3 In this case the ‘responsible authority’ is Southend-on-Sea on Sea Borough Council, and the ‘consultation bodies’ are identified in the Regulations as:

- the Countryside Agency
- English Heritage
- English Nature
- the Environment Agency.

4.4 Prior to this report being prepared, each of these bodies has been consulted by the Borough Council, with a consultation letter sent in November 2004.

The consultation primarily sought views on the matters to be included in the sustainability framework. Responses were made by all four of the bodies.

- 4.5 As a whole the responses received were quite generic, and primarily provided signposts to relevant documents and strategies that each body produced that may contain information of relevance to the SA. This information was taken into account in the SA, especially in the characterisation of the baseline of the Plan area. However, some of the reports referred to by the Consultation Bodies have yet to be produced, and although these appeared as if they may be of some use in the SA in the future, at the current time they are not. Both English Nature and the Environment Agency set out how they would like to be involved in the SA of the LDF from this stage onwards. Informal comments have been received from the relevant Consultation Bodies and amendments relating to these comments have been incorporated into the current draft Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal.
- 4.6 Guidance from ODPM on carrying out SAs, currently itself only in the form of a consultation paper, suggests extending this type of consultation beyond the 'consultation bodies' identified in the Regulations, identifying those that '*may also be consulted*' as including:
- *economic interests and local businesses*
  - *social interests and community service providers*
  - *transport planners and providers*
  - *NGOs such as environmental groups, amenity societies, and voluntary services.*
- 4.7 Such groups are part of the consultation on the Draft Core Strategy with this accompanying Draft SA report. The consultation is however wider than these groups and, at this public participation stage, is open to the whole community.

## **5 Other documents and objectives**

### **Introduction**

- 5.1 It is in the nature of local authority activity and the legislative and procedural requirements upon authorities, together with the requirements upon partner organisations, that there is a great deal of overlap and repetition between organisations, between plans and strategies that are drawn up, and between different visions and sets of objectives. Specifically for spatial planning, the development plan will in future (as a consequence of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) comprise the regional spatial strategy and the local development framework. For Southend on Sea the other part of the development plan (in addition to the LDF to which this SA refers) is the

(currently draft) Regional Spatial Strategy RSS14, entitled the East of England Plan.

- 5.2 Many other documents prepared by the local authority and others provide context to the LDF – in the form of objectives that the LDF needs to help to meet for instance – or complementary material – in the form of policies and programmes.

### **The East of England Plan**

- 5.3 The RSS will provide the direct planning context for the preparation of the LDF, setting out for instance the role that Southend on Sea is expected to perform and its contribution to the region, the level of employment and housing development that the LDF is to make provision for, and various objectives that the LDF is expected to contribute to.

### **Regional and strategic planning context**

- 5.4 *Sub-regional policies*

Southend-on-Sea is one of five authorities classified within the Thames Gateway/South Essex sub-region. The sub region is then split into two, in which, Southend-on-Sea is designated under Thames Gateway South Essex (TGSE).

- 5.5 TGSE is a regional and national priority for regeneration and growth with the potential to make a major contribution to the improvement of the Region's economy. The vision for the area is to improve opportunities and quality of life for local people through establishing the area as a focal point for economic regeneration and investment. The provision of new infrastructure and improved environment is also a priority.
- 5.6 The key objective for the sub-region is to achieve regeneration through jobs-led growth, higher levels of local economic performance and employment, and a more sustainable balance of local jobs and workers.
- 5.7 Policy TG/SE 1: Zones of change and influence, provides for Southend-on-Sea as a cultural and intellectual hub and a higher education centre of excellence, with a focus on:
- Southend Town Centre – regenerating the existing town centre, led by the development of the University campus, to secure a full range of quality sub-regional services and facilities providing 6,500 new jobs and 1,650 additional homes, with upgrading of strategic and local passenger transport accessibility, including development of Southend Central and Southend Victoria stations as strategic transport interchanges; and

- Shoeburyness – development of a major mixed-use development, providing 3,000 new jobs consolidating R&D strengths on a ‘high-tech’ business park and 1,400 additional dwellings, linked to improved access.
- 5.8 The Local Development Documents will provide for 13,000 additional jobs in the Southend area between 2001 and 2021. 55,000 will be provided in the TGSE sub-region as a whole over this period.
- 5.9 By 2011, the A13 Passenger Transport Corridor will be extended from Southend to Basildon and Canvey Island.
- 5.10 In total, Southend-on-Sea will provide 6,000 additional dwellings between 2001 and 2021.
- 5.11 Southend Renaissance will be an Urban Regeneration Company (URC) local delivery vehicle, creating a public/private partnership for the achievement of the employment and housing delivery targets.

### **Regional objectives and targets**

- 5.12 The draft RSS contains fourteen overarching objectives that range from broad themes such as protect and enhance the natural environment, to specific ones about minimising the risk of flooding or recycling previously developed land. The Regional Sustainable Development Framework (RSDF) is a separate document containing a set of objectives for the region. These objectives have been used as the framework for the RSS, and are reflected in the list of objectives used to carry out the SEA/SA into RSS. Whilst presented in a slightly different format, it is confirmed that the set of objectives used for the appraisal of policies in the RSS is consistent with those proposed for the SEA/SA of the Southend-on-Sea LDF.
- 5.13 Appendix D to the draft RSS contains targets and indicators, covering environmental, social and economic concerns. Most of the targets are expressed as directions of change, although some targets, for example, the recycling of land and buildings, waste recycling and modal shift, amongst others, are quantified. These targets have been used in commenting on the performance of the direction of change of the LDF policies.

### **Community Strategies**

- 5.14 Under the new provision for making development plans as explained in PPS12: Local Development Frameworks, *‘the local development framework should be a key component in the delivery of the community strategy setting out its spatial aspects where appropriate and providing a long term spatial vision. Local development documents should express those elements of the community strategy that relate to the development and use of land.’*
- 5.15 The community plan for Southend produced by the Southend Strategic Partnership and called ‘Southend – setting the standard’ (March 2003) sets

the vision for Southend on Sea as '*a vibrant coastal town and prosperous regional centre where people enjoy living, working and visiting*'. This vision is to be achieved through inter-linked themes detailed in the plan, and which are summarised as:

- *prosperous community – a prosperous local economy*
- *learning community – opportunities for learning for all and a highly skilled workforce*
- *safer community – crime, disorder and offending reduced*
- *healthy community – improved health and well-being*
- *environmentally aware community – improved transport infrastructure and a quality environment*
- *supportive community – better life chances for vulnerable people*
- *cultural community – a cultural capital.*

5.16 It is for the LDF to pick up those aspects of these themes towards which it can achieve a contribution through its influence over the use of land, though there is much that is common between these themes and the content of the sustainability framework too. In relation to the SEA, the themes are relatively light on environmental issues, though this is not a concern given the scope and role of the community strategy.

5.17 The community strategy does provide other useful information on the social and economic issues in particular faced by the Borough.

### **Local Transport Plan**

5.18 A further important document where a reciprocal relationship with the LDF will be important to achieve is the Local Transport Plan (LTP). Southend on Sea's LTP for 2000/1/2 to 2005/6 (appropriately called 'Moving forward together') sets out its vision as:

*'reduce congestion in Southend and its hinterland to stimulate regeneration, economic improvement, environmental enhancement and community well being in a sustainable manner'*.

5.19 The vision is accompanied by objectives:

- *improve the economy of Southend and support sustainable economic growth in appropriate locations*
- *protect and enhance the environment and quality of life*

- *improve safety for all travellers*
- *promote the integration of all forms of transport and land use planning, leading to a better more efficient transport system*
- *promote accessibility to everyday facilities for all, especially those without a car*
- *raise community awareness of the effects of continuing traffic growth.*

5.20 Insofar as it is evident what it means, this ‘vision’ might be interpreted as being rather narrow in relation to the agenda of sustainability, and whilst certainly transferable to the LDF as one of the objectives of the Council and its partners, it could not be a sufficient basis for all that the LDF has to address. The objectives do extend the scope of the vision, without really seeming to be particularly consistent with what it says, and so reflect a fuller interpretation of sustainability.

5.21 It is important however that the Council, as all transport authorities, has to produce its next LTP under new government guidelines by July 2005, and these documents (LTP2) are expected to take a longer view than the current round of LTPs. It will be for the LTP and the LDF to be developed on a reciprocal basis, and for the LTP itself to be subject to the process of SA.

### **Thames Gateway Strategic Partnership**

5.22 Another document that is important in determining the task and scope for the LDF is that prepared by the Thames Gateway Strategic Partnership specifically for South Essex. With its ‘*vision for the future*’ set out in this document, the initiative is seen as an ‘*opportunity for driving forward regeneration and achieving growth and prosperity in South Essex as a key part of Thames Gateway*’. The material in this document has been reflected in the East of England Plan, discussed above.

5.23 Some of these documents are also important to the SA and SEA because they are sources of information.

## **6 Character of the Borough of Southend-on-Sea**

### **Introduction**

6.1 This section of the report is a collation of information relating to the Borough of Southend-on-Sea. This information is intended to inform the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the emerging LDF for the Borough, by describing the existing environmental (and to a limited extent social and economic) baseline in the LDF area.

- 6.2 The information presented here is based on a desktop review of the area, as no primary research has been undertaken specifically for the SA. Various sources of information have been used, included reports provided by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council relating to the local authority area and the county, including the environmental report produced for the SA for the East of England Plan (November 2004). In addition to report based information much of the spatial data comes from online Geographical Information Systems (GIS), primarily [www.magic.gov.uk](http://www.magic.gov.uk) and [www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk). A list of information sources can be found in appendix 3.
- 6.3 This report is only intended as a brief outline of the situation in the Borough. The SEA Regulations require that only information as can 'reasonably be required' is included in the environmental report. Therefore at this strategic stage of the LDF the information collected is not to site specific detail, and is more strategic or spatially based to get an understanding of the wider plan area.
- 6.4 The intention of gathering baseline information is to help to identify issues in the plan area that the LDF may impact upon, and in line with the SEA Regulations particular attention is paid to environmental issues. However the majority of sources of information available in this collation exercise were not able to provide detailed information on specific areas of land that might be used in development. At future and more site specific stages of plan making, the Council will have to consider more site specific environmental implications for development. For potential development sites, that are consistent with the overall strategy proposed for the LDF, additional baseline environmental information could be used to assess environmental concerns such as:
- the present or previous use of land and its condition
  - sites with nature conservation value
  - areas of sensitive local character and amenity
  - areas where development could increase the risk of flooding.
- 6.5 The expectation will be for the SEA to show that in making the development provision in the LDF, the Council has identified the environmental consequences of the development of sites and identified whether the provision could be made with the use of other sites with less environmental harm or greater environmental benefit. The SEA Directive requires the LDF-making body to report on the environmental implications of the LDF however, not to make decisions for the LDF based on those environmental implications.
- 6.6 In comment on what appears to be available for the 'baseline', the likely areas of difficulty are:
- the possible lack of sufficiently detailed information at the site level, for example on the biodiversity of sites outside designated areas

- the difficulty of making links between the proposals and policy aspirations of the spatial plan and change in matters such as health and general well being.
- 6.7 A limitation to compiling this report is the level and detail of information that is available at this time for the purposes of SEA and other environmental reporting. Different environmental topic areas have vastly different amounts of data available, and this is often presented in different ways. A balanced and thorough spread of information on the Borough is not possible at this time. Gradually as practice becomes better established on SEA, the way that data is made available may become better tailored and accessible to those carrying out SEA. This is especially in relation to the consultation bodies that are referred to in the SEA Regulations, as bodies with specific environmental responsibilities. At present although there often is much raw data and monitoring of various aspects of the environment available, the effects of new development on the environment are less well known, especially in relation to indirect or secondary impacts.
- 6.8 As part of the sustainability appraisal a form of ‘scoping report’ was sent out to the four consultation bodies as referred to above. Their responses included details of documents and reports that could be useful in the compilation of this report.
- 6.9 The report is arranged around topic areas, covering (although in some cases combining) the list of topics found in Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations. Although the topics are presented separately there is a high proportion of overlap and integration between them, for example biodiversity and landscape, flooding and climate change. At the end of each section there is a paragraph on the ‘implications for development’, which is necessary as the baseline information presented must be viewed with the intention of identifying how the LDF could impact upon the environmental feature through specific policies and proposals.

### **Biodiversity**

- 6.10 The estuary environment to the south of Southend-on-Sea is characterised by extensive mudflats and areas of saltmarsh, all of which are internationally important areas for nature conservation and biodiversity.
- 6.11 To the south of the town are the Benfleet and Southend Marshes. This is an internationally important protected wetland site under the Ramsar convention, a Special Protection Area (SPA), and a nationally important Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The SSSI is made up of various habitat types including grassland and woodland, and predominantly littoral sediment. SSSI evaluation has shown that overall the condition of the SSSI is unfavourable and declining, table 1. The habitat units show that the worst habitat type is the littoral sediment, which is unfavourable and declining, as a result of coastal squeeze and the action of storms. The other habitat types, although in

unfavourable condition, are recovering. The area also has the non statutory designation of an 'Important Bird Area', by Birdlife International, as it supports good populations of several types of bird including, Brent Goose, Grey Plover, Redshank, Knot and Dunlin. Pressures on this area have been identified by Birdlife International, as being predominantly from natural events rather than current human activities, although aquaculture and fishing may have a minor impact.

- 6.12 The other area of international importance for nature conservation is Foulness along the coast east of Shoeburyness. This consists of various types of habitat including the grassland of Shoebury Common, and an area of improved and unimproved grazing marsh on Foulness and Potton Islands. The largest habitat type is the littoral sediment that is an important feeding ground for Brent Geese, and the cockleshell spits supporting one of the largest colonies of Little Terns in Britain. This area is also designated a Ramsar site, a SPA and a SSSI, and in addition is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). As can be seen in table 1, as a whole Foulness SSSI is in a favourable condition. However there is also a large area that is in unfavourable condition and declining in quality, and as with Benfleet and Southend Marshes this is predominantly the littoral sediment habitat. This decline is also being caused by coastal squeeze, as a result of the landward progress of the tidal flats being restricted by the sea wall, and the seaward side undergoing erosion.
- 6.13 The Foulness area also falls within the Mid-Essex Coast 'Important Bird Area' and this large area is important for 18 named bird species. There are many pressures on this area listed by Birdlife International, however it is not clear which impacts are relevant for the Southend-on-Sea area due to the size of the designated area. Threats/pressures may include agricultural intensification/extension; bird disturbance; industrialisation/urbanisation; recreation/tourism – but the main pressure is through natural events, that is, weather.
- 6.14 Immediately adjacent to the western side of the urban boundary, in the adjacent local authority area of Castle Point, are two further SSSIs. These are Great Wood and Dodd's Grove, which are a broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland in favourable condition, and part of a larger area of ancient and semi-natural woodland. The other is an area of natural grassland with over half in unfavourable or declining condition, due to poor management. However it is unlikely either of these will be impacted upon by the Southend-on-Sea LDF.

Table 1: Condition of the SSSIs in and adjacent to the Southend-on-Sea local authority area.

	% Meeting PSA target	% Favourable	% Unfavourable recovering	% Unfavourable no change	% Unfavourable declining	% Destroyed
Benfleet and Southend Marshes	5.43	0	5.43	0	94.57	0
Foulness	77.36	77.07	0.29	0.18	22.46	0
Great Wood and Dodd's Grove	100	89.25	10.75	0	0	0
Garrold's Meadow	43.32	0	43.32	16.40	40.28	0

PSA (Public Service Agreement) target is to have 95% of SSSIs to be in favourable condition or recovering by 2010

- 6.15 In addition an area of the Leigh Flats is designated a National Nature Reserve, and this largely coincides with part of the Benfleet and Southend Marshes.
- 6.16 The Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) for Southend-on-Sea details the habitats in need of conservation and enhancement in the authority area. The LBAP gives details of the habitats and the pressures they may be under, in Essex as a whole and specifically in this area. Habitats include Brackish Lagoons, on Two Tree Island and Leigh Marshes, with potential pressures including human coastal activities including infilling of lagoons, sea level rise, recreation pressures particular on the boundary of lagoons, and intertidal mudflat communities, that support internationally and nationally important populations of migratory bird species. The LBAP specifically mentions the Foreshore at Southend-on-Sea and part of the Benfleet and Southend marshes. Here pressures include coastal squeeze as previously mentioned, land claim, pollution runoff forming algal mats. There are also significant saltmarsh habitats, particularly at Two Tree Island, which are also suffering from coastal squeeze.
- 6.17 Fresh water habitats in Southend-on-Sea include ponds and lakes, of which there are many examples throughout the Borough, including at Friars Park, Priory Park, Shoebury Park, and Churchill Gardens. Factors threatening the habitats here are loss and fragmentation from urban development, water abstraction, pollution, recreation use, and tipping.
- 6.18 Terrestrial habitats mentioned in the LBAP include ancient and veteran trees, although no good information for these exists for Southend-on-Sea. There are 'ancient' hedgerows in the Borough, with examples along the green lane north of Fossetts Camp, and running parallel to Eastwood Boulevard and in the boundaries of Edwards Hall Park. There are several woodland areas of

importance in the Borough at Hadleigh Great Wood (in Belfairs NR), Belfairs Wood, Oakwood and Owl Wood.

- 6.19 Several areas of natural grassland exist in the Borough, including at Belton Hills LNR, in the grounds of Shoebury Coastguard Station, Shoebury Common, Shoebury Old Ranges Nature Reserve, former MOD land at Shoebury, and at Shoebury East Beach on the clifftop.
- 6.20 Other more 'urban' habitats of importance are the allotment sites, with a total of 51.2ha of these sites in Southend-on-Sea, churchyards, private gardens, public parks and railway embankments. Essex Wildlife Trust note that many native species of Britain, such as the fox, are becoming increasingly adapted to urban conditions. Features such as balancing ponds, backgarden ponds offering areas of open water, and parks and gardens provide semi-woodland habitats that support species including woodpeckers, a range of plants, fungi and invertebrates. Similarly there is a wide range of plants and animals that depend on the grass and scrubland habitat that survive on verges and railway embankments found throughout the town. However, development often supports less wildlife than it should through efficient use of land leaving little outside space, and inappropriate landscaping, and there is often poor management of habitats for nature conservation purposes even where they do exist.
- 6.21 The LBAP also identified species of importance that are found in the Borough of Southend-on-Sea. These include various birds, especially those found on the mud flats such as Dark Bellied Brent Geese (2% of the worlds population overwinter here). Other important birds include the skylark and various garden birds. Invertebrates include heath fritillary butterfly (showing a steady increase since reintroduction on Belfairs NR) and the very rare Shriill Carder Bee. Mammals include, bats, the dormouse, water voles, and in the coastal waters off Southend-on-Sea there are whales and dolphins. Other vertebrates of importance are the Great Crested Newt, Adders, Grass Snakes and Slowworms. Flora of importance are the Black Poplar, with 9 mature trees in the Borough (although only 1 female) and the Deptford Pink, found in the Belton Hills LNR.
- 6.22 *Implications for development:* The majority of the sites identified of importance for nature conservation and biodiversity, especially those that are of international importance, are unlikely to be severely harmed by direct disturbance by new development. This is because most of these areas are mudflats and saltmarshes, and are therefore unsuitable for new built development. However, any proposed coastal development will have to take into account the importance of these areas for nature conservation, with development such as ports and marinas likely to have detrimental impacts on the quality of these sites.
- 6.23 There are no terrestrial SSSIs within the Borough, although there are two on the western boundary in Castle Point local authority area. Therefore it is vital

that these are respected by any development that takes place within Southend-on-Sea adjacent to these sites.

- 6.24 Other forms of urban wildlife that are not covered by designation, such as hedgerows, back gardens and railway embankments must also be taken into account in all development proposals in the Plan area. These sites are important to the survival of many species of flora and fauna in the Borough, as they provide 'wildlife corridors' linking wildlife sites within the urban area, and to the open countryside. Species identified through the LBAP must also be given special protection as it is unlikely that they will only be found on designated sites, and ecological survey of sites prior to development is essential to ensure these species are not harmed.
- 6.25 New development in Southend-on-Sea should place a greater emphasis on including wildlife features and open green space as part of the design, in order to maximise the nature conservation value of the urban area.

### **Agricultural Land**

- 6.26 The Borough only contains a very limited amount of undeveloped land on the northern edge, some of which is used for agriculture. Studies have shown that over half of this agricultural land is soil of Grades 1 or 2, the highest quality, and therefore of national importance.
- 6.27 *Implications for development:* This nationally important high quality agricultural soil resource should be protected from irreversible development that would sterilise the resource.

### **Flood Risk**

- 6.28 One of the main risks to human health in the Borough comes from the likelihood of flooding in the area. Environment Agency flood maps show that an area from Leigh-on-Sea round the coast to the boom has a low chance of flood (1 in 200 years). For the most part this flooding only stretches around 100m inland from the sea. However at Southchurch Park to Thorpe Hall golf course, at Shoebury Common and Cambridge Town, and south of the boom at Pig's Bay, the area susceptible to flood comes more than 400m inland, and although much of this area is open space it also includes built development.
- 6.29 However, the entire length of the coast in the Borough has coastal defences, under various ownerships, that help protect the area from tidal flood. Associated impacts of these defences include the 'coastal squeeze' problem that is adversely affecting the important nature conservation and biodiversity habitats of the Thames Estuary.
- 6.30 There is also a risk of flooding along the river through the centre of the built up area of Southend-on-Sea. The flood risk along much of this stretch is moderate to significant, with a 1 in 75 year risk of flooding. However the area

which is predicted to flood is never more than a few metres wider than the river, as it flows from Hadleigh to Prittlewell.

- 6.31 *Implications for development:* Flood represents a significant risk to human health and property in the existing built up area of Southend-on-Sea. Much of this risk is from direct tidal inundation, although at present coastal defences keep this to a minimum. It is therefore important, in terms of human health, to ensure that these defences are maintained to prevent increased flood risk. The river that flows through central Southend-on-Sea also has a higher flood risk related to it, although the land area at risk is limited, to a few metres either side of the river.
- 6.32 New development, in line with PPG25: *Development and Flood Risk* must ensure that it is protected from flooding, and not located so as to exacerbate flood risk to others.

### **Water Quality**

- 6.33 The Environment Agency website contains details of water quality monitoring around Southend-on-Sea, however there are no monitoring points (with data) within the urban boundary.
- 6.34 The South Essex Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (June 2004) states that in rivers in this area urban runoff is causing a particular problem with water quality, by introducing untreated polluting matter directly into rivers and streams. In addition river bank habitats are being adversely affected by the urban nature of the catchment and built embankments to help alleviate flooding.
- 6.35 There are eight bathing water quality monitoring points along the seafront within the Borough. These are at Leigh Bell Wharf, Southend Chalkwell, Southend Westcliff Bay, Southend Jubilee, Three Shells, Thorpe Bay, and Shoeburyness. All of which showed 'good' or 'excellent' quality in the last 2004 monitoring, although all these monitoring points show good quality water dating back to 1997.
- 6.36 *Implications for development:* The water quality within the Borough, and the sea, should be maintained and improved. However, without monitoring of the rivers within the Borough it is difficult to say what level of improvement is needed.
- 6.37 New development should be built only when it ensures that there is sufficient sewerage capacity available, in addition other forms of water quality protection should be included in new development, such as the design of roads to ensure there is no direct runoff into surface water.

## **Air Quality**

- 6.38 Data on air quality supplied by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council shows that within the urban area the average measurement of particulates (PM10) and Nitrogen Dioxide falls below the 40 microg/m<sup>3</sup> objective set in the National Air Quality Strategy. Therefore air quality in the Borough is on track to meet the national quality targets, with a predicted year on year improvement in quality.
- 6.39 There is no Air Quality Management Area declared in the Borough.
- 6.40 There is only one site listed in the Environment Agency pollution inventory that produces air borne pollution. This is the QinetiQ site in Shoeburyness that has recorded release of many substances to the air, including dioxins, cadmium, mercury, VOCs and ammonia.
- 6.41 *Implications for development:* Pollution from vehicles is the biggest contributor to the lowering of air quality in the Borough, and it is important that development takes place within the Borough so as not to cause large increases in road transport and hence detriment to air quality. The *East of England Annual Monitoring Report (2003)* shows traffic levels in the region up 5% in 2002/3 from 1999/00. Other polluting sources will be controlled by means other than the LDF, such as consent licences, but it must be ensured in the LDF that there are suitable sites for this type of development, where needed, away from residential or other sensitive areas.

## **Climate Change**

- 6.42 Work undertaken by the Environment Agency for the East of England predicts that by 2080, if greenhouse gas emission to the atmosphere continues at high levels:
- temperatures will rise by between 3 and 5 degrees Celsius
  - winter rainfall will increase by up to 30%
  - summer rainfall will decrease by 45-60% compared with current patterns
  - sea levels will rise by between 22 to 82 cm, the level depending on a number of factors: ice melt in the Arctic; the amount of green house gases we emit into the atmosphere from now on; thermal expansion of the oceans; the amount of down tilting of the land surface in eastern England (up to approximately 2mm per year)
  - weather patterns could become more extreme (for instance high temperatures recorded occasionally today could become more normal by 2080)

- agricultural practices will change significantly in order to cope with the longer growing season and the reduced soil moisture in summer.

6.43 *Implications for development:* It is clear that there are direct links from this topic to flood risk, and change in natural systems, such as water resources and habitat structure. The impacts from this type of development will be gradual, and all new development will have to take into account the potential impact of climate change. This will include protection from flood (especially tidal inundation), and ensuring that migratory routes for species are maintained and where possible enhanced in order for all species to move with changing climate. In addition every attempt must be made in reducing green house gas emissions within the Borough, this could be achieved by reducing car transport and the use of fossil fuels, and increasing energy efficiency in all new development.

### **Water Resources**

- 6.44 The East of England is the driest region in the country, yet it is the fastest growing. Water resources are limited and there are already supply-demand issues in parts of the region. Agriculture is a major consumer of water for irrigation and farming processes. The expected climate changes will require new approaches to conserve water and, by implication, to protect soils that may be vulnerable to drought.
- 6.45 The Environment Agency has produced a Water Resources Strategy for the East of England looking forward 25 years. A key prediction is that drought conditions are to be more frequent (due to longer, warmer and drier summers).
- 6.46 The SEA of the draft East of England Plan shows that the area in and around the Borough of Southend-on-Sea has a low water availability, and summer water resources are shown as being over licensed/over abstracted. Overall there is an unsustainable abstraction regime.
- 6.47 *Implications for development:* This means all future development needs to include water management strategies, to ensure that demand can be met for potable water, and that usage is efficient and minimised where possible. Demand management is advised, by installing water efficient fittings and appliances in new developments, as well as updating existing development.

### **Landscape Character**

- 6.48 A landscape character assessment was undertaken of Essex and Southend-on-Sea for the Structure Plan review (July 2002). This identified the characteristics of the area and susceptibility to change. The Borough of Southend-on-Sea falls in two character areas, the Thames Estuary and South Essex Coastal Towns.
- 6.49 Characteristics of the Thames Estuary are identified as:

- very wide estuary mouth extending to the open sea
- extensive tidal mudflats/sands and fringing saltmarsh
- large scale landscape with strong sense of exposure
- expansive views in which water and sky dominate, with outline of the Kent coast sometimes visible in the distance
- man-made development restricted to northern boundary, except distinctive landmark of the exceptionally long Southend Pier
- dynamic landscape due to tide and weather's influence
- rough low grazing marsh, rich wildlife
- with an overall character being undeveloped.

6.50 The artificial landscape features are:

- Southend Pier which is 2km long is a major landmark
- river traffic tankers and container ships and smaller boats
- concrete seawalls/promenades
- jetties and groynes
- some poor quality urban development just outside character area is visually intrusive, such as the tower blocks of Southend.

6.51 Past, present and future trends for change are identified as:

- natural coastal process - coastal squeeze
- demand for marinas and port development are possible pressures in the future which would be very difficult to absorb into the landscape.

6.52 Overall the landscape is identified as having a high level of sensitivity to change.

6.53 Southend-on-Sea urban area is identified as the characterisation in the category of 'South Essex Coastal towns'. Specifically it states that Southend on Sea and its associated neighbourhoods is the largest urban area on the South Essex coast, with a dominant grid pattern of streets running parallel and at right angles to the contours. It has a dense urban form, but with some large parks and open spaces.

6.54 The landscape condition is mixed, with poor quality commercial 'shed' development being common within the area. Several areas of the fringes of the town have been identified as 'landscape improvement areas' through the previous Local Plan, and therefore there is an opportunity for these areas to be significantly enhanced upon through appropriate schemes (which could in part include built development).

6.55 The identified pressure and likely future trends for change are:

- urban development pressure likely to be a significant ongoing trend
- areas where traditional landscape character survives will need particular attention

- recreational pressures are also likely to be considerable

- 6.56 *Implications for development:* The Thames Estuary part of the landscape, although very susceptible to harm, is unlikely to be affected by the LDF. Development that may affect it is port and marina development, however this is unlikely to occur in the Borough within the plan period.
- 6.57 Development with the urban area of the Borough will not harm the overall character of the town, and there should also be the opportunity to bring about improvements to some aspects of the urban environment, as well as improvements to the identified landscape improvement areas on the urban fringe.

### **Transport**

- 6.58 Southend-on-Sea is only around 40 miles from the centre of London, with road links via the dual carriageway A127 and A130 roads. The Borough is also well served by rail with two railway lines, and a total of nine stations within the town. One line goes from Shoeburyness, via Southend-on-Sea Central Station, and Basildon to London (Fenchurch Street), the other is from Southend Victoria Station via Billericay and Romford to London (Liverpool Street). Both journeys to London take under an hour. There are also many bus services serving Southend-on-Sea and linking to surrounding areas.
- 6.59 The roads in the area are relatively busy with 66,000 vehicles using the A127 daily (highest in Essex and Southend-on-Sea Area), and 30,000 and 32,000 on the A1159 and A13 respectively.
- 6.60 Just north of the Borough boundary is the London Southend Regional Airport, with a licence to increase passenger numbers from 7,000 per annum to 300,000 per annum.
- 6.61 Southend-on-Sea has been identified through the RSS as a Regional Interchange Centre (RIC), in the East of England, and a defined transport hub for the region as it meets the criteria of:
- access to key mainline railways (north/south routes and east/west routes)
  - served by strategic inter-urban bus/coach links
  - major bus hubs with strong sub-regional bus networks
  - waterway connections within them or nearby.
- 6.62 However, in Southend-on-Sea congestion and under investment in local transport infrastructure is a major problem, affecting the economic viability of the town. Therefore the transport system in the town needs to be modernised and upgraded.

- 6.63 *Implications for development:* In order for the transport system to be improved in the Borough all new development must ensure that it takes proper consideration of the transport needs of the new development. Reducing trips by car is essential to reduce the congestion within the town, in order to bring improvements, both environmental and economic, to the area.

### **Open Space**

- 6.64 A Study of Open Space and Recreation was undertaken in August 2004 to determine the level of provision, and need, within the Borough.
- 6.65 The various parks and recreational resources were assessed with the aim of setting standards for new provision. The study revealed an expected correlation between the density of development and the availability of open space, with greater the density the less open space available. The most central urban wards, such as Kursaal, Victoria and Westborough Wards, have 0.31 hectares or less per 1000 population of Park space. Therefore this means that large areas in the central part of the Borough do not have easy access by foot to a park of any kind.
- 6.66 *Implications for development:* The low level of open space in the central area does mean that any intensification of residential development in this location will result in a drop in the availability of park space per person.

### **Cultural Heritage**

- 6.67 There are five Scheduled Monuments in, or adjacent to, the boundary of Southend-on-Sea Borough. These sites are:
- Prittlewell Priory, these priory remains date from the 10<sup>th</sup> century
  - a univallate hill fort 'Prittlewell Camp' found 500m east of Sutton Crematorium, dating back to the prehistoric Bronze Age
  - Southchurch Hall moated site, 1.1km east of Central Southend-on-Sea Station, dating from the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the associated buildings now house a museum and remains in a generally good condition
  - Defended prehistoric settlement at Shoeburyness, known as the Danish Camp, dating from the Iron Age, a rare example in south east England
  - Cold War Defence boom, this is within the local authority boundary, but stretches out into the Thames Estuary, the boom was built in the 1950s during the Cold War and is the only example of this type of structure of this date in Britain.
- 6.68 Other notable features include the Southend-on-Sea pier, at over 2km long making it the longest pleasure pier in the world. The pier dates from 1889, when work was started, and was completed in its current form by 1929.
- 6.69 There are also around 75 listed buildings and churches in the Borough, two of which are Grade II\* and three Grade I. In addition there are many Buildings of

Local Architectural or Historic Interest and Frontages of Townscape Merit. There are also fourteen designated Conservation Areas within the Borough.

- 6.70 *Implications for development:* Any development in the area will need to take into account the quality of the historic environment, to ensure neither the fabric or setting of historically or architecturally important buildings, or monuments is harmed.

### **Social and economic background**

- 6.71 The SEA guidelines only require that an environmental baseline is set out for the Plan area, there is no such requirement for SA. For this SA however, and in the light of the importance of economic and social considerations to the sustainability of the Southend community, a brief characterisation of the social and economic situation has been undertaken in order to set a proper context for the SA as a whole.

### **Population**

- 6.72 The population has grown rapidly over the last few decades in Southend, driven by inward migration from the rest of the UK, principally London. The 2001 census put the population in the Borough at 160,257. The age profile of Southend in 2001 was; 0-15 years: 20%; 16-59 years: 56.1%, and; 60+ years: 23.8%.
- 6.73 Southend is a contributor to the London economy by having 11,000 residents commute daily to work. People move to the area for job opportunities in Southend-on-Sea but more so for its proximity to London, because there are relatively low house prices to increase the viability of commuting, the quality of the environment and to retire. With this type of demand taking up accommodation there will need to be further capacity if economic growth is to be accommodated.

### **Housing needs**

- 6.74 Southend is the fifth largest urban area in South East England outside London. At 42 dwellings per hectare (2001), the Borough has by far the highest population density in Essex and the second highest in the East of England. Its population has grown rapidly over the last 20 years and will continue to do so.
- 6.75 The age profile has become younger and the increasing needs for housing, leisure facilities, employment, education opportunities, and health care facilities for local residents in a sustainable, focussed way, will be a real challenge for the future.
- 6.76 Southend has approximately 75,000 dwellings (2001). Due to limited land resources and environmental constraints, for the first time Southend will find it difficult to meet the housing needs of its own population. Housing needs and

homelessness are becoming increasingly prominent issues in this area, particularly as pressure is put on the housing stock through the in-migration of people from the London Boroughs.

- 6.77 In response to this need, the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (December 2004) has set out its distribution of dwelling provision 2001-2021 in policy H1. This requires the delivery in Southend of an average of 300 dwellings per year and a total of 6,000 dwellings over the 20 year period. In total, the East of England will have 478,000 dwellings developed over this period, equating to 23,900 dwellings per annum.
- 6.78 *Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Housing Needs Survey, May 2003, Final Report:*  
In this study, affordable housing is taken to be “relets (excluding transfers) available from Registered Social Landlords”. It assumes, after taking several calculations into consideration that the future supply of affordable housing will be 701 units per annum.
- 6.79 The study then estimates that there will be an annual need over the next 5 years for 2,188 affordable homes. The supply to meet this need is estimated at 701 per annum. Therefore, there is an estimated shortfall of 1,487 affordable homes per annum. The shortfalls are for two (748 units p.a) and three bedroom properties (429 units p.a). A 2004 update of this study reduced this estimated annual shortfall, or affordable housing requirement, to 1,363 units.
- 6.80 The *2003 Housing Needs Survey* also highlighted that over the next 5 years there will be a shortage of 3,819 owner-occupied homes – most notably in the 1-2 bed sector. Overall, there is an estimated shortfall of 11,254 dwellings over the next 5 years to 2007 if the market and affordable needs are to be met. The affordable housing requirement accounts for 66.1% of this shortfall.
- 6.81 In 2003, 100% of Southend’s housing completions were on previously developed land.
- 6.82 The pressures faced by the Borough as a result of the inevitable population increases are great, and the limited land resources and necessary amenity and infrastructure, means that there will need to be very good planning to accommodate the inevitable growth.

### **Employment position & economic potential**

- 6.83 The 2001 census shows that:
- there were approximately 74,500 economically active people within the Borough in 2001 (74,000 in 1991)
  - of these about 26,700 out commute daily for work (10,500 of these to London) (26,000 and 11,000 in 1991),

- however there are 19,700 people daily in commuting to the Borough for work (19,000 in 1991).
- 6.84 Overall the level of unemployment at 3.6.% (2001 census), is just above the UK average of 3.4%, although the % unemployed rises to 6.29% in Kursaal Ward, 5.84% in Milton Ward, and 5.47 % in Victoria Ward. Latest NOMIS/ONS unemployment rates for these areas (May 2005) are 2.6%, 6.7%, 4.8% and 5.1% respectively.
- 6.85 An AEA 1998/NOMIS survey showed 5,500 companies operating in Southend-on-Sea, and around 57,000 jobs, with Southend-on-Sea having 69% self containment of work based employees.
- 6.86 Jobs by sector in Southend-on-Sea (1998 statistics), are:
- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| • Public sector:  | 27% |
| • (administration, education and health)                |     |
| • Distribution, hotels & catering                       | 25% |
| • Financial services                                    | 23% |
| • Manufacturing   | 10% |
| • Other services  | 15% |
| (agriculture, construction, transport & communications) |     |
- (AES 1998 / NOMIS)
- 6.87 Independent employment forecasts indicate that, if the market is left to its own devices, the Borough of Southend will lose an additional 3,500 jobs by 2011. This is due to structural problems including declining local employment sectors and difficulties in attracting inward investment. There is a continuing trend for business start-ups and closures. Without appropriate intervention, a vicious cycle of decline will become established.
- 6.88 The draft RSS states that: strategic employment sites should be allocated to support Southend-on-Sea in its role as a strategic cultural and intellectual centre, to strengthen the development of the Thames Gateway. Policy E4 of the draft RSS states that the Local Development Documents will provide the strategic employment sites required in a number of places including Southend-on-Sea.
- 6.89 Southend is undergoing continuing regeneration and enhancement of the Seafront, High Street and the Pier. The Pier's new developments cost £1.9 million from the European funded Southend Seafront High Street and Pier Enhancement ('Sshape') programme.
- 6.90 Southend-on-Sea is ranked at 130 (rank of average rank) in the Indices of Deprivation (ID2004 – local authority level) out of 354 English districts. Some wards contain areas that are in the worst 10% of super output areas (SOA)

nationally, these wards being Kursaal (majority of the ward), Milton and Southchurch.

### **Summary of issues**

- 6.91 The SEA Directive is concerned with the assessment of *‘the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan’*, and this requires where possible some understanding of the ‘baseline’ situation so that the change that might arise from the influence of the plan can be considered.
- 6.92 From the particular nature of the area to which the LDF relates, and to the matters over which the LDF has influence, the environmental assessment of the material included in the core strategy and site specific allocations LDDs in particular, is likely to be most concerned with the implications of the location of development.
- 6.93 Overall the gathering of data on the environmental baseline has served to identify a few key issues in the Plan area:
- the area is under quite high risk of flood, although direct tidal inundation is largely mitigated for through sea flood defences. However tidal effects on the rivers in the Borough is a larger risk, and effects of climate change will only serve to increase this risk
  - habitats of international significance are located within the Borough, although outside the built development boundary. These must be protected from development that would threaten their integrity, such as increased pollution, however the key threat is beyond the control of the LDF and is caused by built development limiting the natural movement of the coastal mudflats inland. These effects of coastal squeeze will be exacerbated by climate change and sea level rise
  - the constrained boundaries of the Borough and the need for new housing is putting pressure on open space within the built up area for development, as well as on the high quality agricultural land on the built up area boundary
  - nature conservation and biodiversity resources within the built up area are limited, and every attempt should be made to conserve and enhance existing resources, and create new ones, as well as the protection and enhancement of wildlife corridors
  - there are increasing traffic levels in the Borough, with consequences for air quality, and new development must help to limit any increase in this, by endeavouring to suggest change to travel patterns (number, length and mode), through the spatial strategy

- studies have identified limits to the availability and accessibility of open space of different types and standard, especially in central Southend-on-Sea
- the East of England, and south Essex in particular has, and will be, experiencing a shortage of potable water supply, therefore this must be taken into account in new development, and every attempt made to include water efficient design into new development
- the quality of the built environment is important, not only with the effect of new building in ‘mending the fabric’, but also in affecting existing areas of identifiable character.

## **7 Sustainability framework and SA of the Core Strategy**

- 7.1 The SA is being undertaken to assess the influence that the LDF is likely to have over development and change according to the likely contribution to the desirable environmental, economic and social objectives that are embraced by a concern to achieve greater sustainability.
- 7.2 A meeting with a wide group of officers from the Council was spent in discussing a way of testing whether what is proposed in the LDF will make the Borough and beyond more or less sustainable.
- 7.3 From the discussion a ‘sustainability framework’ was drawn up, and the views of the consultation bodies were sought on this material before modifying it for inclusion and use in this report. The sustainability framework is intended to identify as concerns (or as ‘environmental, economic and social capital’) the basic things that we want at least as much of in the future as we have now if our occupation of the planet is to be sustainable. These concerns are arranged under headings that use the four themes of sustainable development set out by the government in its UK Strategy. The framework also contains alongside each concern, a statement intended to explain what it is that is important and the direction of change that would be regarded as a desirable.
- 7.4 The sustainability indicator ‘Flood Risk’ has been included within the ‘Prudent use of natural resources’ section, under the ‘Water’ Heading. This objective reflects comments received informally from the Environment Agency.
- 7.5 It is vital to note that whilst there may appear to be conflicts between some of the concerns, the promotion of sustainable development means trying to find ways forward that advance each of the concerns together.
- 7.6 The sustainability framework identifies the way in which the implications of the LDF for the particular concerns contained in the sustainability framework are likely to be addressed. This will be by a combination of quantifying change where possible – essentially where development would change the nature of

land with specified environmental significance – and identifying the likely ‘direction of change’ in other cases.

- 7.7 The sustainability framework applied in this report is set out in Appendix 1.
- 7.8 The appraisal has been carried out in part by the systematic consideration of each of the suggested approaches in the public participation draft Core Strategy LDD against each concern in the sustainability framework. For this LDD, given the strategic nature of the material that it contains, all that can be identified by this process is whether the implementation of the strategy – in its parts and as a whole – would be likely to be beneficial to that aspect of the sustainability framework. This is recorded as a combination of a commentary and a simple symbolic representation of the findings. The use of symbols is explained in Appendix 1.
- 7.9 The consideration of the approaches and suggested policies by reference to the sustainability framework is set out in Appendix 2.

## **8 Consideration of alternatives**

- 8.1 The introduction of the statutory requirement for SA does not introduce a requirement to consider options, but from the SEA Directive there is a requirement to consider alternatives. The relevant section of the Regulations which determines the form of SEAs undertaken, and hence which must be reflected in the SA of the Southend on Sea LDF, has been referred to at para. 1.4 of the report.
- 8.2 Given the type of material that makes up a LDF, the alternatives to what comes to be proposed in the different parts of the LDF could be in terms of:
- the overall scale of development to be provided for
  - the location of development, essentially through the use of different permutations of available land and development opportunities
  - the mix of uses in any location and also the density of development (and hence the amount of land taken for development).
- 8.3 However, in the context of national and regional guidance and with the predominantly urban situation as exists in Southend, the extent of real options available for the spatial strategy may appear to be very limited. Certainly the Draft Core Strategy considered by this report does not make extensive use of options.
- 8.4 There is some consideration of what might be looked at as alternatives in respect of the overall spatial strategy, employment generating development, retail provision, sport and recreation and dwellings, and these alternatives are considered below. Thereafter in most cases the Draft Core Strategy explains

that the approach suggested is considered the most appropriate. However, this is not yet 'set in stone' and there still remains the opportunity to take on board suggestions as to how that approach could be reinforced/made more effective. Some detailed wording alternatives are put forward with regard to the approach and suggested policy (Policy CP5) dealing with minerals (brickearth). Preferred Option 1 is considered to be an appropriately sustainable approach on this matter.

### **Spatial strategy**

- 8.5 Although controlling the level of growth in the area is beyond the control of the LDF, the spatial strategy must take flood risk into account as a potential significant environmental effect of the plan on the environment.
- 8.6 The alternatives to the spatial strategy do not perform as well as the approach presented as the preferred option 1/suggested 'Policy KP1'. This approach, which concentrates growth within the urban area around key activity nodes such as the town centre and district centres, performs better than the alternatives against transport related objectives, the built environment and the efficient use of land. Negative impacts may come as a result of pressure on the already limited open space resource in the town centre areas. The economy of the town is also expected to benefit from the focused regeneration of high profile areas such as the seafront and town centre.
- 8.7 The alternative proposing a more dispersed approach within the existing urban area to accommodating development is not expected to perform as well in relation to transport related objectives. It is also expected to be less attractive in benefits for built character and potentially for the economy because it will not concentrate change and therefore maximise opportunities to improve high profile parts of the town in the same way that the above approach is expected to.
- 8.8 The main issue with the second alternative locating growth as an extension to the town, is the loss of greenfield and potentially of high quality agricultural land. Development would be furthest from the town centre which compared with the other options, is expected to perform least well with ensuring that new trips that are generated take place via soft modes, or by public transport. There are some benefits with this option though. The economy may perform well from the development of a greenfield, high quality business park with good access to the strategic road network, but this is not necessarily better than the first option, comprising the provision of high quality employment land on previously developed land at Shoeburyness. Overall, the appraisal finds that the 'Policy KP1' approach is likely to be more sustainable than the alternatives presented.
- 8.9 All alternatives will have varying effects on flood risk. The preferred option, particularly within the area of North Shoebury, could cause a significant increase in flood risk. Therefore development must be designed to minimise the effect of flooding, and help prevent flooding elsewhere. The first

alternative, which focuses growth on the urban fringe, could pose the same increase in flood risk as the preferred option, as it includes the North Shoebury area. This alternative also proposes development on greenfield sites, which would reduce the absorption capacity of land, therefore resulting in increased flooding elsewhere. The second alternative focuses growth across all parts of the urban area, which could cause significant increase in flood risk, as much of the urban area is along the coastline. On completion of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, it should be used in regard to comparative directions of change between development options.

### **Employment Generating Development**

- 8.10 Preferred Option 1/suggested Policy CP1 – employment generating development - identifies areas for providing employment and specifies the provision required in each of these areas up to 2021. The policy is more sustainable in providing a balanced approach, in protecting and enhancing existing, and providing for new, employment land and premises. The preferred option would lead to economic regeneration where jobs currently exist and where it is required. The policy also seeks to prevent the loss of existing employment land. The alternatives are less balanced spatially and are more restrictive in the location of employment generating development sites. These options would be seen as less sustainable than the preferred option, due to these restrictions.

### **Town centre and retail development**

- 8.11 Preferred Option 1/suggested 'Policy CP2 - town centre and retail development' - takes a sequential approach to retail development in the town centre, which could in effect lead to a range of locations being developed for retail. The approach is spatially specific and identifies locations where certain types (including scale) of retail development are appropriate. The alternative that is presented is to be less spatially specific and simply re-state national planning policy and the sequential approach to retail development in a more generic way. What is difficult to determine is whether in fact this would lead to more or less sustainable consequences. In planning terms, the spatial approach gives proper guidance of the Council's views of what is appropriate and where. In economic terms, being more spatially specific is more likely to deliver development more quickly, to the benefit of the economy and to the community as a whole.

### **Sport, recreation and green space**

- 8.12 Preferred Option 1/suggested 'Policy CP7 - sport, recreation and green space' - seeks to safeguard all existing and proposed sport, recreation and greenspace facilities from loss or displacement, and to enhance that provision in accordance with the level of new housing and population development, with specific types of additional provision proposed. In addition, the quality of existing sport, recreation and open space provision will be improved where possible. Two alternatives to this policy are presented, which both propose to

enable the development of new recreation facilities in the urban fringe, and therefore have similar impacts. One of the main disbenefits of these alternatives would be the further encroachment of the urban area into the countryside, with impacts on the landscape, and potentially of the loss of high quality agricultural land. Socially, this could lead to improvements by enabling more equitable provision around the edge of the town, and in environmental terms this may take pressure from open space and locally important nature conservation areas within the town. But this would have cost implications and without allowing some new development to take place on the edge of the town, its deliverability is questioned. One means of securing contributions could be through the development of private sports facilities in the urban fringe, but there would be environmental impacts with this option. The alternatives perform better in social terms, but less well in environmental terms, but their deliverability is questioned.

### **Dwelling Provision**

- 8.13 Preferred Option 1/suggested Policy CP8 – dwelling provision – identifies areas for providing housing and specifies the provision required in each of these areas up to 2021. The policy requires proposals to contribute to local housing needs, which includes affordable housing thresholds. The policy also specifies the provision of not less than 80% of residential development on previously developed land, which supports national policy. The preferred option provides a focus on a balanced approach, which could be viewed as more sustainable than the alternatives. The alternative approaches would reduce local provision for a certain amount of local need, as these approaches specify a less balanced approach to housing development locations.

### **Other alternatives**

- 8.14 This report seeks to identify whether what is proposed is always sufficient, taking into account the use in the SEA Directive of the word ‘alternatives’ rather than ‘options’, and also the test of reasonableness that is included, or whether improvements could be made.
- 8.15 The other policies largely set performance standards for development. As long as the policies perform as well as they can in relation to the sustainability framework the consideration of alternatives which heighten the importance of one set of objectives over another, for instance environmental objectives over economic ones, just to satisfy the purposes of the SEA Directive is not considered to add anything to the process. The draft Core Strategy LDD is considered to set out reasonable alternatives where appropriate.
- 8.16 With the spatial strategy examined for the SEA, then the proposals put forward to meet the development requirement will in effect have been subject to an SEA, if they are consistent with the spatial strategy. However proposals that are significant in scale or which could have significant environmental effects ought to be subject to some further examination for the SEA at the appropriate time. For such proposals in the LDF, the Environmental Report will report

environmental impacts that are site specific and not therefore identifiable in the reporting of the implications of the spatial strategy and any alternatives in this current document.

## **9 Findings of the SA**

- 9.1 The task of the Core Strategy LDD is to set the LDF underway by interpreting the national and regional policy context to the particular circumstances of Southend on Sea, and by establishing a framework and a set of tasks to be carried through in other parts of the LDF. This appraisal considers that what the Core Strategy LDD does in particular is to take on the role of setting out a strategy for making a positive contribution to desired change in the Borough, and in a way that will enable many partners to be part of carrying the strategy forward. This inclusiveness is an intended characteristic of spatial planning.
- 9.2 One of the ways in which the Core Strategy LDD does this is by setting out a set of objectives that are particular to the future of the Borough and specific in quantifying the provision made for development for instance. However, it is the recommendation of this Sustainability Report that an additional objective be developed in relation to climate change and related effects, such as flood risk. The objective could read, 'Secure effective and efficient sustainable development, to minimise the impact of climate change, such as promoting sustainable construction and minimising flood risk.'
- 9.3 The policies in section 2, the Key Policies, deal with the way that the development should be distributed according to the main areas of change in the Borough, and set out the principles that should be met by all development taking place, and these generally accord with the principles of sustainable development. The third policy in this section describes the role of the planning system in delivering the changes sought by the Core Strategy and the material that the Council is going to use under the new planning arrangements.
- 9.4 The content and level of detail of these policies is appropriate for the Core Strategy. The emphasis is on consolidation of the overall form of the Borough with reinforcement of the different functional areas, and on the reuse of land and improvement of the physical form whilst achieving economic and social benefits. The policies set out how the proposed development is intended to assist in bringing about change in these locations, and what is sought appears sound from the view point of this appraisal.
- 9.5 The remaining sections in the Core Strategy LDD deal with specific forms of development and the scale of provision for these, and they deal with the performance sought from development taking place. Again there is an appropriate level of specificity and an expectation that all development will contribute to the achievement of the objectives set out for the strategy. Thus there is for instance, clear requirements for how the form of development that takes place, with the addition of appropriate developer contributions, will bring

about the type of greenspace needed to achieve the quality of the urban area planned for.

- 9.6 It is a specific requirement of the SEA Directive (rather than anything with its origin in planning legislation) that there should be an explicit consideration of alternatives in making a plan, and that the environmental implications of these are reported upon. The Core Strategy LDD does not present many alternatives. The overall scale of development for instance is something that is provided for from the Regional Spatial Strategy rather than being something determined by the LDF, and for much of the policy material intended to provide for the implementation of the strategy the Council has felt that there are no meaningful alternatives.
- 9.7 Where the Council feels that alternatives have some meaning and there are choices to be made is in the consideration of the distribution of development. In this matter however the Council's choices are limited by the particular circumstances of the Borough with its essentially built up nature and closely drawn administrative boundaries, and also by the expectations of national and regional planning policy on the sequence in which land is considered when development locations are sought. Of the possible alternatives identified, this appraisal is most supportive of the suggested approach that is set out in detail.
- 9.8 Overall therefore, from the point of view of this sustainability appraisal, the Core Strategy LDD has four strengths:
- it seeks to be positive in providing for the delivery of change to meet the needs of the Borough in the context of what is sought from the regional plan
  - it sets out a framework for the other parts of the LDF to take forward
  - it recognises the role that development can have in bringing about the type of change needed and seeks the best from development
  - it promotes a spatial strategy that makes efficient use of the land resource whilst avoiding high environmental impact, and which is intended to bring about regeneration and should lead to patterns of development and activity that are more sustainable.

## Appendix 1 Sustainability Framework

Notes: doc – matter where prediction of outcome likely to be presented in terms of ‘likely direction of change’

quan – matter where prediction of outcome likely to be presented in quantified terms

Concern	Explanation and desirable direction of change	Means of identifying and reporting impact and contribution of the proposals and policies in the LDF
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to enable people all to have similar and sufficient levels of access to services, facilities and opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>doc – likelihood of increase in facilities and mix of uses</li> </ul>
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to provide the opportunity for people to meet their housing needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>quan – no of dws created</li> <li>quan – no of affordable dws (by different types) likely to arise - regional target is for a minimum of 30% of all housing to be affordable</li> <li>doc – but little reliability of prediction</li> </ul>
Education & Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to assist people in gaining the skills to fulfil their potential and increase their contribution to the community</li> </ul>	
Health, safety and security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to improve overall levels of health, reduce the disparities between different groups and different areas, and reduce crime and the fear of crime</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>quan – area and population subject to increased or decreased risk of flooding</li> <li>doc – likelihood of increased or decreased health standards (but little reliability of prediction)</li> </ul>
Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to value and nurture a sense of belonging in a cohesive community, whilst respecting diversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>doc – but little reliability of prediction</li> </ul>
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to maintain and enhance the diversity and abundance of species, and safeguard these areas of significant nature conservation value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>quan – area of significant habitat affected</li> <li>quan – potential area of significant habitat created / better managed</li> <li>doc – likelihood of increase in biodiversity from creation of opportunities</li> </ul>
Landscape character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to maintain and enhance the quality and character and cultural significance of the landscape, including the setting and character of the settlement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>quan – area of open land affected</li> <li>quan – area of designated landscape affected</li> <li>doc – likelihood of harmful change to character of landscape creating setting of the urban area</li> </ul>
Built environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to maintain and enhance the quality, safety and distinctiveness of the built environment and the cultural heritage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>quan – area of useable and amenity open space affected</li> <li>quan – potential area of useable and amenity open space created</li> <li>quan – area of valued townscape harmed by change</li> <li>doc – likelihood of increase in urban quality through new provision and investment</li> <li>doc – likelihood of increase in urban quality through emphasis on quality</li> </ul>

Prudent use of natural resources		
Air	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to reduce all forms of air pollution in the interests of local air quality and the integrity of the atmosphere</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>doc – likelihood of increase or decrease in emissions. Regional target is for stabilising car traffic levels in Southend at 1999 levels and to increase the proportion of freight carried to and from ports by rail to 30% by 2020. Regional target to increase the proportion of energy met from renewable sources (on-shore + off-shore) to 44% by 2020.</li> </ul>
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to maintain and improve the quantity and quality of ground, sea and river waters, and minimise the risk of flooding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>doc – likelihood of increase or decrease in emissions</li> <li>quan – number of planning applications granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flood risk.</li> </ul>
Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to use land efficiently, retaining undeveloped land and bringing contaminated land back into use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>quan – area of open land affected irreversibly by development.</li> <li>quan – area of damaged land likely to be brought back into use - national and regional previously developed land target is 60% and minimum dwelling densities at 30 dwellings per hectare.</li> </ul>
Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to maintain the resource of productive soil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>quan – area of productive land affected</li> </ul>
Minerals and other raw materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to maintain the stock of minerals and other raw materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>quan – area of potential minerals extraction put beyond viable exploitation by development</li> <li>doc – efficiency of the use of primary and secondary materials</li> <li>doc – likely affect on reuse and recycling of materials - regional target to recover 70% of household waste by 2015</li> </ul>
Energy sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to increase the opportunities for energy generation from renewable energy sources, maintain the stock of non renewable energy sources and make the best use of the materials, energy and effort embodied in the product of previous activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>quan – contribution likely from energy generation from renewable source schemes</li> <li>quan – contribution likely from energy generation within new buildings</li> <li>doc – likelihood of increase in efficiency of energy use in new development</li> </ul>
Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment		
Local economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to achieve a clear connection between effort and benefit, by making the most of local strengths, seeking community regeneration, and fostering economic activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>doc – likelihood of increase in desirable economic characteristics</li> </ul>
Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to maintain and enhance employment opportunities matched to the size of the local labour force and its various skills, and to reduce the disparities arising from unequal access to jobs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>quan – potential number of new jobs in different sectors and match to predicted needs of workforce</li> </ul>

---

Wealth creation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• to retain and enhance the factors which are conducive to wealth creation, including personal creativity, infrastructure, accessibility and the local strengths and qualities that are attractive to visitors and investors</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• doc – likelihood of increase in desirable economic characteristics</li></ul>
-----------------	--	--

### Use of symbols

In relating the approaches in the Core Strategy LDD to the sustainability framework the following symbols are used to summarise relationships identified:

- consistency between the approach and the sustainability concern
- x conflict between the approach and the sustainability concern
- ? likely relationship but cannot be identified at this level
- no relationship

## Appendix 2 Appraisal of the Core Strategy Approaches

<b>Spatial Strategy</b>		
<b>Preferred Option 1/suggested Policy KP1: Focus growth and regeneration in selected areas</b>		
The spatial strategy concentrates all development within existing urban areas including the town centre, the seafront and the existing commercial/industrial areas. 80% of development is expected to take place on previously developed land.		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	Concentrating new development in the central area and district centres of Southend, will continue to promote the provision of services, facilities and jobs in locations accessible by public transport. The policy expects that new development will make a positive contribution towards improving the effectiveness of public transport or take advantage of accessible locations. Positive future impact on providing for equitable levels of accessibility including for those without access to a car.	●
Housing	Housing needs are to be met on a range of locations.	●
Education & Skills	The spatial strategy makes provision for a university campus. Whilst this is likely to draw people into the town for education, it will also provide opportunities for the existing population to take advantage of training and education opportunities associated with a university.	●
Health, safety and security	Redevelopment of large central areas and around local centres could provide the opportunity to improve areas susceptible to crime. Impacts on health and safety difficult to predict.	●
	Development in areas of high flood risk has the potential for significant impact on health and safety of both new and existing residents.	X
	Development at North Shoebury and much of the sea front is at risk of flooding. All new development in these areas at risk of flood will have to be designed to minimise risks to safety.	
Community	Unpredictable relationship.	?
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	The spatial strategy to a large extent avoids previously undeveloped land, thus protecting greenfield habitats. However, previously developed sites, that have been undisturbed for many years may have reverted to locally important habitats, as well as sites of more local or unidentified importance for nature conservation eg back gardens. The impact of urban intensification and redevelopment of brownfield sites would need to be examined at the detailed site development stage.	?
Landscape character	There are no urban extensions proposed. Positive impact on the landscape character, through improved urban design.	●
Built environment	The urban focus of the spatial strategy will concentrate investment opportunities in existing urban areas enabling the regeneration of the built environment. Intensification and redevelopment could put pressure on historic assets, particularly where they comprise an inefficient use of urban land. However, there are other policies in the LDF to protect heritage assets.	●

Prudent use of natural resources		
Air	Locating development around accessible locations is most likely to create opportunities for trips to be made by soft modes and also by public transport, minimising the likely future impact of activity associated with new development on air quality. Increasing the population density in the urban area may lead to increased levels of support for public transport with the potential to improve the quality of bus and train services for the existing population.	●
Water	Water supply is already constrained in the East of England. An increase in the population will create additional demands for water supply. Potential negative future impact on water quality and quantity. Development in these areas, and in particular North Shoebury, could cause significant increase in flood risk. Development must be designed in such a way as to minimise the effect of flooding, and help prevent causing increased flooding elsewhere.	X
Land	80% of development expected to take place on previously developed land, thus promoting the retention of undeveloped land and promoting reclamation of contaminated land.	●
Soil	No areas of high quality agricultural land are affected by the policy proposal.	●
Minerals and other raw materials	Tenuous relationship with this objective.	-
Energy sources	Tenuous relationship with this objective	-
Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment		
Local economy	The spatial strategy promotes the regeneration of the town centre and seafront, and the development of a university and a hi-tech business park. This has the potential to secure vast improvements to the local economy. Whether new economic activity will be realised will depend on the success of the town in attracting new employment.	●
Employment	A considerable amount of new employment opportunities are expected to arise from the provision of high quality employment land in the town centre and at Shoeburyness hi-tech business park.	●
Wealth creation	Improvements to the environmental quality and image associated with a revitalised town centre and seafront are expected to have positive consequences for the local economy and subsequent wealth creation.	●

<b>Alternative</b>		
<b>Option 2: - Focus additional growth on the urban fringe</b>		
An alternative to the preferred option is to direct growth to the urban fringe. This will require the allocation of greenfield land currently outside the settlement limits.		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	There is an assumption that land furthest distance from the town centre is less accessible. However, there is an opportunity to development a mixed use extension with high quality public transport access to the town centre.	● / x
Housing	With better economies of scale associated with a large scale urban extension, there are improved prospects for securing higher levels of affordable housing.	●
Education & Skills	All of the options promote the development of a university campus. Whilst this is likely to draw people into the town for education, it will also provide opportunities for the existing population to take advantage of training and education opportunities associated with a university.	●
Health, safety and security	Potential to secure new recreation opportunities and access to the countryside via the urban extension. Extensive new area of development able to be designed to deter criminal activity. On the otherhand, it is less likely to provide any improvements with respect to the design of existing built up areas. Mixed performance.	● / x
Community	Development in the east of the urban area may cause an increase in flood risk, and therefore the safety of residents here. Development on greenfield land will also reduce the absorption capacity of land, causing increased risk of flooding elsewhere. Potential opportunity to develop a new community with its own identify and services and facilities.	?
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	This option puts pressure on natural assets around the edge of the town. Although the value of these habitats is unknown as there are no precise locations for development proposed at this stage, the impact on this objective is unknown.	?
Landscape character	An urban extension could result in an adverse impact on the landscape character around the town. However, some parts of the urban fringe are identified as landscape improvement areas - development could secure the positive reinstatement of character beyond the extension.	● / x
Built environment	Lost opportunity to redevelop and improve the built fabric of the town. However, reduced pressure on built heritage assets.	● / x
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	The consequences for air quality are difficult to predict. Mixed use extensions with high quality public transport access could support walking, cycling and public transport movements. However, peripheral developments tends to give rise to increased use of the car.	x
Water	Water supply is already constrained in the East of England. An increase in the population will create additional demands for water supply. Potential negative future impact on water quality and quantity. In general, growth to the north of the urban area of Southend-on-Sea should not pose any flood risk, although development to the east may result in increase flood risk, especially in north Shoebury.	x
Land	Development on greenfield land will also reduce the absorption capacity of land, causing increased risk of flooding elsewhere. Considerable amount of greenfield land will be irreversibly lost to development. This option does not allow for the reclamation of	x

Soil	contaminated land. Areas of high quality agricultural land are prevalent to the north of the town. This may be affected by this option.	<b>X</b>
Minerals and other raw materials	Tenuous relationship with this objective.	-
Energy sources	Tenuous relationship with this objective	-

Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment		
Local economy	Reduced investment in the regeneration of the town centre and seafront areas, with less beneficial consequences for some sectors. However, urban extensions could bring forward peripheral employment land with good access to the strategic road network which could be highly attractive to potential employers. Opportunities to develop a prestigious, peripheral business park as part of an urban extension, with positive implications for employment generation. A development strategy that focuses on the periphery of the settlement is less likely to secure strategic regeneration plans for the centre of the town. The impact on some sectors such as the leisure and tourism economy may be less beneficial than the option presented in policy KP1. On the otherhand, high quality, greenfield employment sites may lead to better job opportunities.	● / <b>X</b>
Employment		●
Wealth creation		● / <b>X</b>

<b>Alternative</b>		
<b>Option 3: Focus growth across all parts of the urban area</b>		
An alternative to the preferred option is to disperse growth across the urban area. This will require redeveloping land at much higher densities and intensification could lead to the loss of open space.		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	Development will be spread throughout the urban area, some sites may be in less accessible peripheral neighbourhoods.	?
Housing	A collection of smaller sites is likely to yield fewer affordable housing units than the other 2 options.	?
Education & Skills	All of the options promote the development of a university campus. Whilst this is likely to draw people into the town for education, it will also provide opportunities for the existing population to take advantage of training and education opportunities associated with a university.	●
Health, safety and security	Loss of important local greenspace could lead to reduced opportunities for outdoor recreation, with adverse consequences for health. Impact on crime unpredictable. Development in areas of high flood risk has the potential for significant impact on health and safety of both new and existing residents. This risk will vary depending on where within the borough development happens, as not all parts of the borough are at the same risk of flood.	<b>X</b>
Community	Unpredictable relationship.	?
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	The spatial strategy to a large extent avoids previously undeveloped land, thus protecting greenfield habitats. However, previously developed sites, that have been undisturbed for many years may have reverted to locally important habitats, as well as sites of more local or unidentified importance for nature conservation eg back gardens. The impact of urban intensification and redevelopment of brownfield sites	?

Landscape character	would need to be examined at the detailed site development stage. There are no urban extensions proposed. Positive impact on the landscape character.	●
Built environment	An unfocused approach to redevelopment could lead to changes in character and higher densities across the town, including in areas where it might not be appropriate. Lost opportunity to consolidate development and promote comprehensive regeneration around central areas and district centres.	X
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	Some development may not be in the most accessible locations. Lost opportunity to promote the use of public transport with subsequent adverse consequences for air quality.	X
Water	Water supply is already constrained in the East of England. An increase in the population will create additional demands for water supply. Potential negative future impact on water quality and quantity. Development in some parts of the borough could cause significant increase in flood risk. Therefore development must be designed in such a way as to minimise the effect of flooding, and help prevent causing increase flooding elsewhere. This option has the potential development to be put in locations less at risk of flooding.	X
Land	Because of additional pressures on urban greenspace, more previously undeveloped land may be affected by this strategy option. This option would help maximise the reclamation of contaminated land.	X
Soil	No areas of high quality agricultural land are affected by the policy proposal.	●
Minerals and other raw materials	Tenuous relationship with this objective.	-
Energy sources	Tenuous relationship with this objective	-
<b>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</b>		
Local economy	Dispersed development could lead to a reduced critical mass of investment in key areas such as the town centre and the seafront, with a reduced impact on physical regeneration and image enhancement.	?
Employment	Employment provision expected to come forward on a range of sites. It is not clear whether the Shoeburyness Business Park forms a component of this option. The development / redevelopment of a collection of smaller dispersed employment sites is less likely to deliver a high quality, prestigious business park associated with a larger, peripheral location.	?
Wealth creation	A dispersed development strategy may be less likely to secure strategic regeneration plans for the town. The impact on some sectors such as the leisure and tourism economy may be less beneficial than the preferred option.	?

<b>Key Development Principles</b>		
This approach and suggested policy KP2 establishes a number of development principles that will apply to all development proposals in the Borough.		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	The policy seeks improvements to the transport network, including sustainable modes of travel. Positive relationship with equitable levels of accessibility.	●
Housing	No relationship	-
Education & Skills	No relationship	-
Health, safety and security	The policy makes no reference to detailed design issues like crime, but there is the opportunity for this to be dealt with in policy CP4.	-
Community	No relationship	-
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	Requirement for development proposals to 'respect the natural environment' is fairly weak. This could be substituted with 'result in no net loss of environmental assets'	X
Landscape character	Promotes the recycling of previously developed land, thus protecting the loss of open land on the edge of the settlement. However, the policy is quiet on the positive enhancement of the environment, such as landscape. It is noted that policy CP4 provides the more detailed policy framework on environmental matters. Whilst this mentions the management of the urban fringe, it is not explicit in setting out the desire to secure the <i>enhancement</i> of the landscape.	X
Built environment	The policy seeks quality design in new developments.	●
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	Policy seeks the provision of sustainable transport improvements and energy efficient design - potential to minimise the effects of air pollution associated with new development.	●
Water	Sustainable drainage, thereby helping to reduce the risk of flood, is promoted. However, the policy doesn't mention the need for water efficiency measures as part of new development.	X
Land	Promotes the recycling of previously developed land, but does not specifically mention contaminated land.	●
Soil	Promotes the recycling of previously developed land, thus protecting soil resources.	●
Minerals and other raw materials	The reuse of resources is promoted in new developments. Bullet 11 could be extended to be more specific about recycling waste arising from new developments - this is not covered anywhere else in the LDD - check.	●
Energy sources	Energy efficient design is sought in new developments.	●
<b>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</b>		
Local economy	The policy generally seeks high quality new developments - potential to improve the overall image and perception of the town as a place to live, work and visit.	●
Employment	No relationship	-
Wealth creation	No relationship	-

<b>Key Implementation and Resources</b>		
This approach and suggested policy KP3 sets out what the Council intends as part of its suite of planning documents, and something on the process it will follow in dealing with applications. It is more of a 'mission statement' than development plan policy and difficult to appraise in this exercise as a consequence. What is likely to be sought from developer contributions is also identified and this is useful to set out in the plan.		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	Contributions towards public transport and walking and cycling facilities are to be sought. And travel plans will be required in some cases. The policy provides the opportunity to improve accessibility by non-car modes	●
Housing	Planning agreements with developers to deliver affordable housing will assist in meeting this particular need and improve access to housing	●
Education & Skills	Policy could state the intention to negotiate training provision as part of new employment developments	X
Health, safety and security	There is no particular relationship	
Community	Community facilities will be sought from developer contribution and this is a positive approach	●
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	Biodiversity enhancement could form part of general environmental enhancements to be sought in planning obligations.	●
Landscape character	Landscape enhancement could form part of general environmental enhancements to be sought in planning obligations.	●
Built environment	Public art and 'design excellence' required of new development will help improve the built environment	●
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	Contributions towards public transport and walking and cycling facilities are to be sought - opportunity to limit the effects of new development on air quality.	●
Water	Contributions towards flood protection and sustainable drainage schemes.	?
Land	No relationship	-
Soil	No relationship	-
Minerals and other raw materials	No relationship	-
Energy sources	No relationship	-
<b>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</b>		
Local economy	The intention of dealing expeditiously with planning applications concerned with economic development is a positive one	●
Employment	The general approach in the policy should bring positive benefits for retaining and attracting employment	●
Wealth creation	The policy indicates the Council's willingness to work with partners to facilitate development, through the approach to its own land and with the use of compulsory purchase orders, and these will be beneficial to this aspect	●

<b>Employment Generating Development</b>		
The preferred option approach and suggested Policy CP1 identifies the number of jobs for which 'provision is made' in the plan period and their distribution across the plan area, and seeks to ensure that new employment generating activity contributes to the overall strategy		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	The core policy seeks to focus development in the central area but also provides for new employment in association with new residential development and in both respects seeks to increase the accessibility of employment opportunities	●
Housing	The need to reinforce a close relationship between residential development and employment opportunities is recognised positively in the policy	●
Education & Skills	The policy emphasises the links between skills development and employment opportunities as well as promoting the more direct growth in the educational sector as a source of employment	●
Health, safety and security	No direct link is identified, though improving the availability and distribution of rewarding job opportunities is likely to bring indirect benefits in these areas	-
Community	There is much in the policy that seeks to use investment in employment generating activity to strengthen distinctive parts of the area and reinforce local community linkages	●
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	There is nothing in the policy to explain the land use implications and so the effects on biodiversity cannot be identified	-
Landscape character	The land use implications of the policy cannot be identified other than the general support for the patterns of development promoted through the key spatial strategy policies	-
Built environment	If properly directed, investment in employment generating activity can be used to improve the urban fabric, and this is recognised in the policy as well as there being specific provision for improvement to the environment providing for possible exception to the general intention of retaining existing employment sites	●
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	Achieving a better mix of activity ought to reduce travel demand and with it some emissions to the air, though there is the further need to control any noxious emissions from employment activity	●
Water	There is no direct link between the policy and the management of the water environment	-
Land	The policy is consistent with the intention of the key spatial strategy policies that land be used well, including by the recycling of previously developed land	●
Soil	There is no direct link between the policy and stewardship of this resource	-
Minerals and other raw materials	There is no direct link between the policy and the management of minerals though construction associated with new employment generating development is bound to take such materials	-
Energy sources	If reduced travel demand can be achieved through the management of the mix of activity this will have beneficial implications for energy use.	●

Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment		
Local economy	The policy is specifically about strengthening the local economy as well as ensuring that Southend makes an appropriate contribution to regional development	●
Employment	The policy is specifically about making provision for employment	●
Wealth creation	There is much in the policy about improving the conditions for wealth creation, through investment in various forms of infrastructure for instance	●

Alternative option 2 - does not make best use of brownfield land and therefore does not encourage the regeneration of urban areas and deal with contaminated land issues. Not addressing regeneration of existing areas, could limit the creation of sustainable communities in urban areas. However, the option would increase the opportunity to encourage sustainable communities on the urban fringe, if included within a mixed use development with housing and suitable service infrastructure, but there would be greater environmental impacts than the preferred option, such as impacts on landscape character and open space on the urban fringe. The proposed development on greenfield sites would also reduce the absorption capacity of land, therefore increasing flooding risk elsewhere.

Alternative option 3 - focuses growth across all parts of the urban area, using smaller dispersed employment sites which are less likely to deliver a high quality, large peripheral location. This may result in a limited supply of land and constrain economic growth in the area. In doing so it may reduce the attraction of the area to prospective new and existing employers. In dispersing development throughout the urban areas, it could detract from required key investment to the town centre and the seafront. This alternative could also result in overdevelopment and loss of open space in urban areas.

<b>Town Centre and Retail Development</b>		
The preferred option approach and suggested Policy CP2 emphasises the role of the town centre as the focus for retail investment and for uses attracting large numbers of people, and goes on to make specific quantitative and locational provision		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	Emphasises the town centre as the focus for retail investment and for uses attracting large numbers of people is consistent with seeking greater accessibility for the greater number of people, though there will be a need to provide for complementary development to help achieve this aim	●
Housing	Residential development is potentially a competing use for town centre development opportunities, and whilst a good mix of activities is essential to a sustainable community, care must be taken that town centre activities are not deposed	?
Education & Skills	There is no direct link between the policy and these matters	-
Health, safety and security	Increased activity and a good mix of activity throughout the day is consistent with safety and security	●
Community	Reinforcing the town centre is consistent with increasing the distinctiveness of Southend and hence with community identity	●
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	There is no direct link between the policy and biodiversity	-
Landscape character	There should be no adverse effects to landscape character from the policy	-
Built environment	Investment in the town centre with good standards of design and build quality should bring continued and valued improvements to the urban fabric	●
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	Focussing activities that attract large numbers of people in the town centre is consistent with efficient use of transport and hence with endeavours to reduce emissions from transport	●
Water	There is no direct link between the policy and the management of the water environment.	-
Land	The policy is consistent with the intention of the key spatial strategy policies that land be used well, including by the recycling of previously developed land.	●
Soil	There is no direct link between the policy and stewardship of this resource	-
Minerals and other raw materials	There is no direct link between the policy and the management of minerals though construction associated with new retail development will use minerals and other materials	-
Energy sources	Increasing the critical mass of town centre uses in Southend is consistent with decreasing the amount of energy taken by satisfying travel demand	●
<b>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</b>		
Local economy	Improving the town centre should increase the proportion of disposable income spent locally	●
Employment	Increasing the ability of people to obtain what they want from shops in Southend should add to the employment associated with retail and other town centre uses	●
Wealth creation	An attractive town centre with good retail, cultural and leisure facilities will assist in attracting and retaining business activity	●

<b>Transport and Accessibility</b>		
The preferred option approach and suggested Policy CP3 makes clear links between development activity and the need to improve transport and accessibility, and between the LDF and the Local Transport Plan		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	There are strong intentions within the policy to see an integrated approach to the improvement of all forms of transport to bring about greater accessibility for more people.	●
Housing	There is no relationship	-
Education & Skills	There is no direct relationship other than through improving the means people have to get to the source of education and training	-
Health, safety and security	Safety is an explicit criterion by which any transport proposals will be assessed, and generally making it easier for people to get to about improves security, whilst reducing car dependency is consistent with better health	?
Community	Greater accessibility is a prerequisite for more cohesive communities	●
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	There is no direct link between the policy and biodiversity	-
Landscape character	There should be no adverse effects to landscape character from the policy	-
Built environment	Reducing the impact of cars – whether moving or parked – is consistent with an improvement in the quality of urban spaces	●
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	Reducing travel demand and achieving a shift to public transport and to cycling and walking for more trips would reduce emissions to the air	●
Water	There is no direct link between the policy and the management of the water environment	-
Land	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Soil	There is no direct link between the policy and the productivity of soil	-
Minerals and other raw materials	Transport infrastructure has been a major user of minerals and other materials, and any change away from increasing road capacity as a means of dealing with transport demand will be valuable, though the policy may lead to some additional provision, through its support for London Southend Airport for instance, and some road building will be associated with development provided for in the plan	?
Energy sources	Reducing travel demand and achieving a shift to public transport and to cycling and walking would have beneficial implications for energy use	●
<b>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</b>		
Local economy	General improvements to accessibility can only be good of the local economy	●
Employment	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Wealth creation	Quite complex issues arise here, with a shift from car dependency and divisive forms of transport provision a desirable strategy generally, but a concern to appeal to business investors with shorter term views leading to a commitment to improve transport infrastructure	?

<b>The Environment and Urban Renaissance</b>		
The preferred option approach and suggested Policy CP4 seek to protect and enhance natural and built environmental assets.		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	Design and layouts of new development is crucial in promoting the accessibility between places, particularly by soft modes. The policy could have a criterion requiring safe, permeable new developments and spaces that encourage walking. Alternatively this could be dealt with in the SPD town design guidelines	<b>X</b>
Housing	No relationship	-
Education & Skills	No relationship	-
Health, safety and security	The policy makes no reference to the need for new development to be designed so as to limit the opportunities for criminal activity.	<b>X</b>
Community	New development that is distinctive can strengthen local identity associated with a place. The policy seek distinctive new developments that achieve a sense of place.	●
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	The policy protects and seeks the enhancement of biodiversity resources. The supporting text also cites the opportunity to enhance biodiversity assets on the green grid routes. Positive performance, especially as consideration is being taken of those nature conservation assets that are not statutorily protected.	●
Landscape character	The effective management of the urban fringe is something the LDD seeks to achieve. However, it is not explicit in setting out the desire to secure the <i>enhancement</i> of the landscape as part of new developments.	?
Built environment	The policy seeks high quality design in new developments. This will also be supported by SPD.	●
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	Could state more explicitly the requirement for sustainable layouts that promote sustainable travel movements.	<b>X</b>
Water	The policy does not mention water conservation or reducing flood risk. Bullet point 3 could seek design solutions that secure energy and <i>water</i> conservation. Bullet point 13 could seek to promote new development away from high risk flood areas.	<b>X</b>
Land	Promotes the recycling of previously developed land.	●
Soil	Soil is a 'natural resource' which is to be protected in bullet 12.	●
Minerals and other raw materials	Bullet 3 could include requirements for the type of layouts in new development that support waste recycling.	<b>X</b>
Energy sources	Energy efficient design and renewable energy technologies are sought in new developments.	●
<b>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</b>		
Local economy	The policy seeks to protect and enhance environmental quality and promote high quality, distinctive new developments - potential to improve the overall image and perception of the town as a place to live, work and visit.	●
Employment	No relationship	-
Wealth creation	No relationship	-

<b>Mineral and Soil Resources</b>		
Preferred Option 1 and suggested Policy CP5 sets out an approach intended to make the exploitation and use of mineral and soil resources more sustainable. Options 2-4 suggest the possibility of detailed wording changes only		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Housing	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Education & Skills	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Health, safety and security	The policy provides for proposals that would lead to unwanted effects on health and safety to be resisted	●
Community	There is no direct link with the policy	●
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	The protection of biodiversity is incorporated into the policy	●
Landscape character	Landscape character is not specifically addressed in the policy, and is not brought into consideration by any other part of the Core Strategy though will be addressed in the development control policies that complement the Core Strategy and is an issue by virtue of national policy	X
Built environment	There is no direct link with the policy	-
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	Avoiding pollution to the air could be made a more explicit part of the policy, as a concern for local amenity already is for instance	X
Water	Avoiding pollution to the water environment could be made a more explicit part of the policy	X
Land	A comprehensive approach to the restoration of land is integral to the approach provided for in the policy	●
Soil	The protection of soil resources is part of the purpose of the policy and the maintenance of high quality agricultural land would be an important consideration in meeting the requirement for minerals	●
Minerals and other raw materials	Meeting the requirement for minerals is part of the purpose of the policy, though the concern is the appropriate use of minerals and there is a specific requirement to maintain the stock of minerals in a form suitable for future use	●/X
Energy sources	Transporting materials by energy efficient methods is identified as a desirable aim wherever this is possible	●
<b>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</b>		
Local economy	Minerals extraction and transportation can continue to contribute to the local economy	●
Employment	There is employment associated with the exploitation and use of mineral and soil resources, and this will not be harmed by the policy	●
Wealth creation	A supply of minerals and other materials is necessary for many forms of economic development and the policy aims to maintain this provision, but for the provision to be made in the most appropriate way	●

<b>Community Infrastructure</b>		
The preferred option approach and suggested Policy CP6 requires development proposals to contribute to improving the education attainment, health and well being of local residents and visitors, though it is not specified whether this is by their nature or in the form of financial contribution secured by planning agreements. The policy provides a list of those matters to which contributions will be sought, provided the (different) tests established through (changing) national policy and legal precedent are met		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	Improving accessibility is a central theme in the construction of the approach set out	●
Housing	There is no specific mention of housing issues, nor any particular effect on the delivery of housing except perhaps through the increased cost or reduced market viability of residential development (contributions towards the affordable housing need are addressed in policy CP8)	-
Education & Skills	The enhancement of education facilities in the town is expressly sought as a community benefit to be provided from development	●
Health, safety and security	Additional health facilities are expressly sought as a community benefit to be provided from development	●
Community	The policy is specifically concerned to ensure that development proposals add to rather than detract from the community	●
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Landscape character	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Built environment	Some of the community provision to which contributions are sought from development would improve the built environment	●
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Water	There is no direct link between the policy and the management of the water environment	-
Land	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Soil	There is no direct link between the policy and the productivity of soil	-
Minerals and other raw materials	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Energy sources	There is no direct link with the policy	-
<b>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</b>		
Local economy	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Employment	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Wealth creation	By seeking a strengthening of community facilities and the features that are make the town distinctive the policy will assist in enhancing the ability to attract and retain business activities, providing the expectation of developer contributions does not discourage investment	●

<b>Sport, Recreation and Green Space</b>		
Preferred Option 1 and suggested Policy CP7 provides for the protection of existing open space and sports facilities and sets out detailed quantified requirements for further provision as part of new development		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	The policy is specifically concerned with improving access for all of the population to open space and to recreation and sports facilities	●
Housing	The policy is intended to produce better overall forms of housing development with the appropriate open space and other facilities considered as part of the scheme	●
Education & Skills	There is no direct relationship with the policy	-
Health, safety and security	The policy should help to produce an environment which encourages healthy activity, and which helps create an atmosphere of personal safety	●
Community	The types of new development that would flow from the application of this policy would improve the sense of community	●
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Landscape character	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Built environment	his policy would help to improve the built environment	●
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Water	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Land	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Soil	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Minerals and other raw materials	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Energy sources	There is no direct link with the policy	-
<b>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</b>		
Local economy	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Employment	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Wealth creation	By seeking a strengthening of community facilities and the features that make the town distinctive, the policy will assist in enhancing the ability to attract and retain business activities	●

<b>Dwelling Provision</b>		
Preferred Option 1 and suggested Policy CP8 sets out detailed targets for the overall provision of housing according to different parts of the plan area, and detailed targets for the performance required from development taking place		
<b>Concern</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Direction of change</b>
<b>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</b>		
Accessibility	There is no particular link between the level of housing provision and accessibility, though where development takes place and the form of schemes that take place will have implications, and the policy recognises this potential and is as positive as it can be through seeking mixed use and the provision of local facilities for instance	?
Housing	The policy is specifically about the provision of housing to meet different types of need, and its contribution is potentially very positive	●
Education & Skills	There is no direct relationship between the policy as stated and these matters, but nothing is missing either	-
Health, safety and security	The form in which new development takes place will have significant implications for these issues, and the policy seeks to provide the right context	●
Community	There is much in the policy that seeks to achieve positive benefits for the community, in terms of the mix of uses and of housing types and tenure for instance	●
<b>Effective protection of the environment</b>		
Biodiversity	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Landscape character	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Built environment	Investment in new development, properly guided by good principles of location and form, will enhance the urban environment	●
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>		
Air	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Water	There is scope for new residential development to perform better than has been the case previously in terms of water conservation, and this is a matter that needs to be addressed in subsequent more detailed policies and through supporting guidance	?
Land	This policy is concerned with the greatest user of land but both the key spatial strategy policies and parts of this policy promote the recycling of previously developed land	●
Soil	There is no direct link with the policy	-
Minerals and other raw materials	Minerals and other raw materials will be used in the creation of the development provided for in this policy	X
Energy sources	There is scope for new residential development to perform better than has been the case previously in terms of energy conservation and generation, and these are matters that need to be addressed in subsequent more detailed policies and through supporting guidance, though energy efficient design and renewable energy technologies are sought in new developments by policy CP4	●
<b>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</b>		
Local economy	Investment in housing will bring benefits to the local economy, from construction through to the increased spending on local services by new residents	●
Employment	Further employment will arise from new investment and additional expenditure in the local economy	●

Wealth creation	The right quantity and mix of housing is essential to help stimulate business investment and accommodate additional workers, and there can be indirect benefits from greater confidence in the area	●
-----------------	---	---

Alternative option 2 – does not make best use of brownfield land and unable to encourage the regeneration of urban areas. In not providing regeneration of existing areas, this alternative would limit the promotion of sustainable communities in urban areas. The option would, however, increase the opportunity to encourage sustainable communities on the urban fringe, if included within a mixed use development with employment and suitable service infrastructure, but in doing so it would effectively be an inefficient and unsustainable use of land. With improved economies of scale with large urban extensions, there would be better prospects of securing higher levels of affordable housing. However, there would be greater environmental impacts than the preferred option, due to the impact on landscape character and open space on the urban fringe.

Alternative option 3 - would limit the locations available for housing to the urban areas, reducing higher levels of affordable housing which could be secured by the other alternatives. This alternative focuses growth across all parts of the urban area, therefore encouraging regeneration of the urban areas and increasing opportunities to create sustainable communities. However, it could lead to overdevelopment of urban areas, with possible loss of urban open space.

## **Appendix 3 Baseline information sources**

### **Internet Resources**

[www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk)

[www.english-nature.gov.uk](http://www.english-nature.gov.uk)

[www.airquality.co.uk](http://www.airquality.co.uk)

[www.magic.gov.uk](http://www.magic.gov.uk)

[www.southend.gov.uk](http://www.southend.gov.uk)

[www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk)

### ***Select Bibliography***

Local Transport Plan for Southend 2001/2 to 2005/6

Southend-on-Sea Borough Local Plan (March 1994)

Southend-on-Sea: Replacement Borough Local Plan: Issues Report (January 2001)

Southend-on-Sea '*Policy Statement on Flood and Coastal Defence*' (July 2003 – July 2008)

Southend-on-Sea Local Biodiversity Action

Southend-on-Sea, Air quality information – source 4<sup>th</sup> annual progress report July 2004

Essex and Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan Review, Landscape Character Assessment – July 2002 – Chris Blandford

Essex and Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan Review, Nature conservation and Biodiversity (August 2002)

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council - A Study of Open Space and Recreation, August 2004

East of England Plan Sustainability Appraisal Report, November 2004