

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
<b>Leigh Seafront Action Group – Mrs Jane Lovell</b>				
1531	Para. 45	<b>Support</b>	The consolidated community approach preferable.	Noted.
1528	Question 1	<b>Support</b>	Yes	Noted.
1529	Question 2	<b>Support</b>	Yes	Noted.
1530	Question 5	<b>Support</b>	there should definitely be retained car parking and increased if possible, support the still vibrant shopping and restaurant scene	Noted.
<b>Mrs Hillary Davidson</b>				
1449	Para. 46	<b>Support</b>	Option 4	Noted.
1450	Para. 50	<b>Support</b>	I support the idea of opening up the heart of the site and demolishing the 2 houses between the community centre and Police Station.	Noted.
1451	Para. 52	<b>Support</b>	Particularly with regard to 'greening' up the area which has always looked stark	Noted.
1453	Para. 57	<b>Support</b>	In considering the layout in front of the main buildings, would it be possible to take the footpath up close to the buildings, leaving an area to allow for the dropping off of users by taxi or cars eats which obstruct the free flow of cars along Elm Road - particularly as many who use the centre are disabled	Noted. The community centre currently has disabled parking bays to its frontage, as noted in the 'access and egress' section of the Brief. It is suggested that this is highlighted within the development framework section of the brief to identify future potential for drop off bays / disabled bay to the front of the community centre if compatible with the regeneration aims of the brief to enhance the quality of the street frontage.
1454	Para. 65	<b>Support</b>	This should be a priority	Noted.
1455	Para. 79	<b>Support</b>	It would be important to reset abolish a regular daily bus service throughout the day to/from North Leigh-which	In recent weeks bus operators have altered bus services to ensure continued viability of each

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			only has a limited daytime service on a Tuesday.	company and taken a view on service requirements in Southend, the changes have meant increased frequencies in some areas but reductions or complete withdrawal from others. In Leigh, service alterations have reduced the provision via Grand parade but increased the frequency via Elm Road. The Council continues to work with operators to establish improved bus services where possible and this includes an increase in the services operating between the North and South of the Borough.
1452	Question 3	Support	I support approach 2	Noted.
1456	Question 5	Support	Yes I think that the policy suggested should be followed as long as public transport is improved	Noted.
1457	Question 6	Support	Yes, it seems to be moving in the right direction	Noted.
<b>Leigh Town Council – Mr Paul Beckerson</b>				
1458	Question 1	Object	The Town Council considers that the Brief and the Borough Council have completely placed the wrong emphasis on the status of the site and therefore their focus is based on a false premise. The Brief places the site in a south to north context in that it sees it as a transition area between the commercial and residential parts of the Town.	The objector does not suggest what a more appropriate response or description would be. To the north we find a streetscene largely comprised of residential properties, to the south commercial/leisure offer (indeed the site itself sits within the boundary of the District Centre, and is designated as secondary shopping frontage, an approach taken forward by the Borough Local Plan (1994) and progressed within the emerging Development Management DPD following a review of these designations). The boundary of both the District Centre and Secondary Shopping Frontage

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				<p>terminates to the northern boundary of the site and the neighbouring Havengore House (residential use to the north). The Brief acknowledges this and it is the Council's view that this is an appropriate response to the descriptive analysis of the site, as confirmed by the designations within the Development Plan. It is suggested that a plan is included within Section 2, together with supporting text, clarifies the designations on the site (secondary shopping frontage, locally listed building, and district centre).</p>
1459	Question 2	<b>Object</b>	<p>The Town Council is deeply concerned at the Brief's failure to understand the nature of the use of the site which has moved on considerably in the last 6 months and which is set to improve dramatically in the next few years with the enhanced use of the Community Centre. It is not a conglomeration of old, dated buildings with back-land car parking. It is fast becoming the social, cultural and community hub of Leigh.</p>	<p>The associated text within p16-20 that relates to Question 2 is a summary of the consultation responses collected during the community planning events, largely undertaken prior to Leigh Town Council's occupation and management of the community centre. The Land Use sub-section within Section 2 however (paragraph 30-1) recognises the attraction offered by the Community Centre and that its public use is well established. The Town Council have recently taken over the management of the community centre and its increased use, and work of the Town Council to promote and enhance this, is noted. It is suggested that an additional paragraph is added to Section 4 to summarise other issues raised during this consultation:</p> <p><a href="#">Public Consultation 2013</a>  <a href="#">Public consultation on the proposed Brief was</a></p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				<p>held between 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013 and 13<sup>th</sup> May 2013. As part of this consultation respondents were asked whether they thought all the relevant issues for the site had been identified through the community consultation events. The following issues were identified by respondents during this consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for development aimed at maximum Elm Road frontage – including built development abutting the blank gable of the Police Station;</li> <li>• Leigh Town Council is currently managing the Community Centre and have, in recent months, seen increased use of the Centre for community, social and cultural functions;</li> <li>• When discussing increase in public space/markets the impact of noise on gardens which back onto the site should be taken into consideration, as should the policing of such events to guard against anti-social behaviour to local residents;</li> <li>• Agree the connexions building does serve well but the building itself is not in keeping with the area and should be transformed (in character) or absorbed into the already established community centre building;</li> <li>• Any new development must be in keeping with the Leigh area; must not</li> </ul>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				<p>overlook gardens which back onto the development, be overbearing, or reduce light.;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature of business uses needs careful consideration due to the direct impact to residents backing on the area.</li> </ul>
1460	Question 3	<b>Object</b>	<p>The Town Council consider that the Brief projects a missed opportunity to provide a comprehensive and well thought out development of this major site within Leigh. As stated above, the focus of the Brief takes the wrong orientation for the site and the Brief, it is felt, is written and in such language as to deride the site, its uses and play down its importance to the Town.</p>	<p>Question 3 relates to the preferred approach for the redevelopment of the site. It is considered that the language used provides a positive account of how the site can be brought forward for redevelopment for the benefit of the wider community. In paragraph 51 (p22) the preferred option is described as being considered to '...offer the best long-term potential for attractive and sustainable development.' In paragraph 52 (p22) of the Brief the site is described as presenting opportunity to 'establish a significant new public space for Leigh on Sea, retaining the character of the area and providing opportunity for a genuine mix of uses....any new buildings should be built of a high standard...'. It is considered that the existence of the Brief affirms the Council's recognition of the sites importance to Leigh. In light of this it is not considered that further amendments to the language are necessary.</p>
1461	Question 4	<b>Object</b>	<p>There is a presumption that development is always an improvement - this is not necessarily the case, it depends on need and quality. We have pointed out the error in the Brief in viewing the site from the wrong orientation</p>	<p>It is not clear from the consultation response what an alternative orientation would be and which paragraphs in particular are seen to be erroneous. However, the very existence of the</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			<p>and thus down playing its importance. Some of the comments in Section 6 are totally erroneous in their interpretations of buildings, particularly the Community Centre, and the whole tenor of the paragraphs referring to the Community Centre seem to be written from an intentionally demeaning and devaluing stance .</p>	<p>Brief and the community consultation events that have been central to its production, highlight the Borough Council's commitment to its regeneration and recognition of the contribution it makes and will make to the local community.</p> <p>In regard to the paragraphs relating to the Community Centre more specifically (paragraphs 70-3) these are not intended to demean the community centre, but rather to provide an appraisal of its current form, highlighting the scale of the building and the current access arrangements. For clarification it is suggested that paragraph 70 is updated to read: 'The Community Centre is a large and relatively complex building. There is a ramp from the street to the reception area, and access is made possible to the first floor by lift however more generally, accessibility is impeded by small changes of level throughout the Centre.'</p> <p>It is suggested that paragraph 71 is updated in light of Leigh Town Council's management of the centre to read: 'The Centre is, in its current form, being managed for a 5-year period from August 2012 by Leigh Town Council who are promoting its continued community use for a range of functions, including the Town Council Offices.'</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				<p>Paragraph 72, suggest the first sentence is deleted and the paragraph start with the sentence 'Options to remodel the building to improve and diversity its use...'. It is also suggested the 4<sup>th</sup> sentence is amended to read 'This should include, <i>as a minimum</i>, the retention of the <i>prominent</i> Elm Road façade...'. And that the 5<sup>th</sup> sentence is amended to read 'Any modifications to, or redevelopment of, the <i>community centre</i> building would need to be handled <i>sensitively</i> in a way which respected the scale and massing of the original building and <i>sought to preserve and enhance</i> key historic features (<i>such as the red brick gabled façade</i>), but as the building is not listed there is reasonable license for creative changes, <i>particularly internally</i>.'</p>
1462	Question 5	<b>Object</b>	<p>Despite repeated requests by the Town Council the car parks in the Town are poorly signed. This should be rectified before any idea of additional extensive car parking is considered.</p> <p>See comments above about car parking. Alternative provision such as park and ride should be considered. It is difficult to see a net gain from the parking proposed when the surrounding development's parking needs will need to be factored in. The Council will not accept any form of underground or multi storey option.</p>	<p>The point regarding signage is noted and has been passed to the Council's Highways Management Team. The Council is currently consulting on its Streetscape Manual SPD, the purpose of which is to reduce unnecessary street / visual clutter throughout the town, which would be made possible through an audit of streets and the implementation of guidance contained within the Manual. This process would allow the site to be appraised and opportunities for signage, appropriate to the context, investigated.</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				<p>As a point of clarification, the Brief does not suggest that the site is capable of providing additional extensive car parking. See paragraph 83 (p29) 'The amount of parking required should be equal to or in slight excess of the existing parking provision, but is not expected to grow substantially.' It is suggested that for purposes of clarification the sentence is amended as outlined above.</p> <p>In regard to parking provision, the plan for the site has been devised by the consultants, AMUP, following the community consultation events and extensive appraisal of the site. The configuration of the preferred option indicates that parking could be re-provided at the current level, with the potential for the addition of a small number of extra spaces. The Brief acknowledges at para.88 (p30) that parking will need to be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards and it is considered that this will be determined through the planning process – the Brief provides a guide for how development comes forward, it does not constitute an implementation plan. The potential for a park and ride facility is not considered to be within the remit of this Brief.</p>
1463	Question 6	<b>Object</b>	The simple answer to this question is NO - for all of the above reasons. What the Brief has missed is the essence and heart of Leigh - something perhaps only residents can explain.	Please see responses to 1458-1463 above.



Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
<b>Mrs Patricia White</b>				
1494	Para. 65	<b>Support</b>	Absolutely agree re: planting, Elm Road is badly in need of greening up, please don't forget the site to the north - Havengore House and beyond - when this is being planned!	Noted. However, the Development Brief relates to the 'Elm Road' site only as defined by the red line plan, aerial photograph p4, and as such contains preferred options specific to this site.
1493	Para. 72	<b>Comment</b>	This sounds very flexible but it is assumed that as the community has stated that it wants this building to remain a community building that it will not be redeveloped as flats. Regarding the original units being opened up it is hoped that would be to independent and/or smaller concerns rather than for larger retailers such as one of the large chain supermarkets.	<p>Paragraph 72, suggest the first sentence is deleted and the paragraph start with the sentence 'Options to remodel the building to improve and diversity its use...'. It is also suggested that the 5<sup>th</sup> sentence is amended to read 'Any modifications to, or redevelopment of, the <b>community centre</b> building would need to be handled <b>sensitively</b> in a way which respected the scale and massing of the original building and <b>sought to preserve and enhance</b> key historic features, but as the building is not listed there is reasonable license for creative changes, <b>particularly internally</b>.</p> <p>The small shop units to the front of the community centre are highlighted within the Brief as offering potential to create an active frontage on Elm Road. These are small units and unlikely to be suitable for a larger retailer. For purpose of clarification it is suggested that the sentence could be amended to read 'It would particularly benefit the character of the historic frontage if the original units to the ground floor frontage could be reinstated or opened up in a more sensitive manner to incorporate an active</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				use, such as small individual retail units, at ground floor, and the landscaping of the space given careful consideration.
1498	Para. 95	<b>Comment</b>	Any new residences should be affordable housing rather than luxury flats. The square would need effective lighting to keep it a safe area.	<p>Comments noted. The provision of affordable housing on the site would be expected to be in-line with Policy CP8 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy (as set out in bullet point one of para. 95), which will be a material consideration in determining any planning application for the site.</p> <p>It is suggested that the issue of lighting is added as a point of clarification to paragraph 85 as follows: 'The approach to the layout of the urban area means that the parking which is provided will be more accessible and easy to use, and will be presented in a safer environment, including a sympathetic lighting scheme that complements both the parking, residential, commercial and public uses of the site.'</p>
1499	Para. 100	<b>Support</b>	agree	Noted.
	Para. 101	<b>Comment</b>	Any new residences should be affordable housing rather than luxury flats. The square would need effective lighting to keep it a safe area.	<p>Noted. Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy would be a material consideration in determining any planning application for the site.</p> <p>It is suggested that the issue of lighting is added as a point of clarification to paragraph 85 as follows 'The approach to the layout of the urban area means that the parking which is provided will be more accessible and easy to</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				use, and will be presented in a safer environment, including a sympathetic lighting scheme that complements both the parking, residential, commercial and public uses of the site.
1490	Question 1	Support	This appears to be a good summary of the character and uses of the area in question	Noted.
1492	Question 2	Support	I was unable to attend the follow-up in September but it appears that the community's desire to keep the relevant buildings for the benefit of the community appears to have been taken into consideration.	Noted.
1495	Question 4	Comment	I think the guidelines generally cover the issues and opportunities. Personally I am happy with this option, though wonder how the people under compulsory purchase order consider this. Keeping the buildings, greening the area, and all the environmental aspects sound appropriate. I would say that if residential building is considered that it should be houses and not yet another blocks of flats.	Noted.
1492	Question 5	Support	Agree parking should remain about the same, wouldn't agree with decked parking	Noted.
1496	Question 5	Support	Appropriate	Noted.
1497	Question 6	Comment	Yes, generally I think the framework is a good guide apart from the concern regarding possibly only keeping the façade of the community centre. In the long term, being in the heart of Leigh, this site should always be kept as a centre of the community.	Noted.
<b>TC Matthew Chartered Architect – Mr Tim Matthew</b>				

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
1501	Question 1	<b>Comment</b>	A key issue that the residential plots in the Development Brief area interfere with the site's otherwise community/health/education use is missing.	Noted. It is suggested that for clarification the following paragraph is added to the Land Use section at p12. 'The site also includes a private residential property which adjoin the former Leigh Town Council Offices, which sits in the middles of the site adjacent to the community centre and the access route to the public parking area. Any plans for the redevelopment and reconfiguration of the site will need to take account of these residents and be sensitive to the associated impacts upon them.'
1502	Question 2	<b>Comment</b>	Potential for development aimed at maximum Elm Road frontage - including built development abutting the blank gable of the police station - is missing.	It is suggested that an additional sub-heading and paragraph is added to the end of section 4, following paragraph 47 to outline key issues raised during the public consultation on the draft document. For details see response to rep 1459.
1504	Question 3	<b>Object</b>	Acknowledgement that creating a significant gap in the frontage of an existing perimeter block is likely to have a detrimental effect on the coherence of the streets it defines is missing. This is important to the site and land uses because this key principal of the preferred approach is likely to undermine the inherent quality of the urban form and public realm it seeks to improve.	The preferred option, presented by the Brief, seeks to remove the pair of semi-detached properties on the site (one a private dwelling, one the former town council offices) to provide opportunity to maximise the sites development potential and create new street frontages within the site. While it is acknowledged that this punctuates the perimeter block on the Elm Road frontage, the Brief seeks to ensure the comprehensive redevelopment and enhancement of the site, including the creation of new frontages within the site, and it is not considered that this punctuation would have a detrimental effect on the character of Elm

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				Road, particularly given the significant improvements and enhancements to both the public realm and built form that are anticipated. It is suggested that this can be further clarified within the Brief at <a href="#">paragraph 50</a> to read: 'The second approach would open up the heart of the site by removing the pair of houses on the Elm Road frontage. <a href="#">While this would punctuate the existing perimeter block, it would have wider ranging benefits for the regeneration of the site as a whole, creating new street frontages within the site and maximising development and regeneration potential...</a> '
1505	Question 5	<b>Support</b>	Public car parking is an appropriate 'back of house' use of the land in the centre of the deep urban block in this location.	Noted.
<b>Mr James Nichols</b>				
1503	<b>Land Ownership</b>	<b>Comment</b>	12 Lymington Avenue does benefit vehicle access to the rear with a purpose built drive established for over 10 years. We acknowledge and appreciate that plans must take into consideration this continued access.	Noted.
1506	<b>Planting</b>	<b>Support</b>	New planting would benefit/soften the area but must be kept in check.	Noted. Suggest additional to paragraph 65 to read: ' <a href="#">An appropriate landscaping management plan should be put in place</a> '.
1508	Para. 44	<b>Comment</b>	When discussing increase in public space/markets it must be taken into consideration the impact of noise to gardens which back onto the area. Also policing of such events to guard against anti-social behaviour to local residents. Agree the 'connections' does serve well but the	It is suggested that an additional sub-heading and paragraph is added to the end of section 4, following paragraph 47 to outline the key issues raised during the public consultation on the draft document. See response to rep 1459 for

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			building itself is not in keeping with the area and should be transformed (in character) or absorbed within the already established community building.	detail.
1509	Para. 45	<b>Support</b>	I agree that this could be an option with improvements made to appearance of the area and removal to the noisy council depot.	Noted.
1510	Para. 45	<b>Comment</b>	Any new building must be in keeping with the Leigh area. Must not overlook gardens which back on the development/overbearing/reduce light. Also nature of business needs careful consideration due to the direct impact to residents backing on the area.	These comments are noted and it is suggested that an additional sub-heading and paragraph is added to the end of section 4, following paragraph 47 to outline the key issues raised during the public consultation on the draft document. See response to rep 1459 for detail.
1512	Para. 50	<b>Comment</b>	Agree that this would be a viable option but need to be careful regarding 'other activities' which could create noise to residents who back onto the site. Also 12 Lymington's access to the rear must not be impacted which i see has been taken into consideration below. New Development must not negatively impact neighbouring gardens - limited to 2 story height/no loss of light/not overlooking gardens/ in keeping with the Leigh heritage. Should not include council housing.	<p>Suggested addition to the end of paragraph 50 to read: '<a href="#">...The use of this new public space, and indeed the new development itself, will need to have due consideration to the amenity of existing neighbouring residential buildings.</a>'</p> <p>Further detail on this matter is provided within paragraph 61 – 62. A further addition to the end of paragraph 63 to read '<a href="#">...Any uses of the site should give due consideration to the character and amenity of existing neighbouring residential uses.</a>'</p> <p>The Brief refers to the policy requirements for the provision of 'affordable' housing (as opposed to 'Council housing') in line with policy CP8 of its adopted Core Strategy DPD. If the number of dwellings provided on the site</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				exceeds 9 then affordable housing will be expected to be provided in accordance with this policy.
1513	Para. 51	<b>Comment</b>	Agree that this would be a viable option but need to be careful regarding 'other activities' which could create noise to residents who back onto the site. <b>Also 12 Lymington's access to the rear must not be impacted which I see has been taken into consideration below.</b> New Development must not negatively impact neighbouring houses & gardens - limited to 2 story height/no loss of light/not overlooking gardens/ in keeping with the Leigh heritage. Should not include council housing.	Noted. Suggested amendment to paragraph 50 outlines in response to comments 1512 above.  In regard to the access 12 Lymington Avenue benefits through the public car park, it is suggested that the following is added between paragraphs 59 and 60: 'In addition, 12 Lymington Avenue benefits from rear access through the public car park. It is not envisaged that the preferred approach to the redevelopment of the site will impact upon this arrangement, and it is recommended that this is retained and addressed through any development proposals.'
1517	Para. 56	<b>Object</b>	Public square sounds good in theory but must take into consideration the neighbouring residents. How will noise be controlled and guarded against anti-social behaviour which normally goes hand in hand with public spaces within a town.	The comments are noted and it is suggested that for purposes of clarification the following sentence is added to the end of paragraph 56: 'Due consideration should also be given to the amenity of neighbouring residential properties in regard to the public function of this space and associated uses.'
1516	Para. 57	<b>Comment</b>	'Other Activities' must be defined and needs careful consideration in line with the neighbouring residents.	The comments are noted and it is suggested that bullet point 2 of paragraph 57 is updated to read: 'The space should have a simple, clear layout which lends itself to efficient use primarily for parking and other activities appropriate to a 'public square' such as farmers markets associated with the community centre.'

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				The amenity of residents should be given due consideration when planning any activities for the use of the public space.'
1518	Para. 61	<b>Comment</b>	New development must be within 2 storeys and not too close to gardens which back on the site and away from 12 Lymington's rear access point.	The comment is noted and it is suggested that amendments to <u>paragraph 61</u> are included to read: 'The predominant scale of the wider area is two to three storeys, although for residential properties this largely means 2 storeys with rooms in the roof, and there is an expectation that this will be taken as a broad guide as to the likely suitable height of future development within the site. Particular consideration should be given to the height and position of neighbouring residential properties.'
1519	Para. 62	<b>Object</b>	Gardens must not be overlooked which would cause privacy issues. Also type of residential must be kept to private only in line with buildings which are aesthetically pleasing.	Paragraph 62 highlights the need to give due consideration to the amenity of neighbouring residential properties, including minimising inter-visibility between habitable rooms, legislative controls on right of light for existing rooms in existing properties, the relationship between new buildings and adjoining gardens. In light of this it is not considered that further clarification is required here.
1522	Para. 69	<b>Support</b>	Police building must remain and be renovated/cleaned up	Noted. The police station is a locally listed building and the preferred approach sees it retained and opportunities for remodelling the northern gable end investigated to create an active frontage onto the new square. It is suggested that an additional line is added to the end of paragraph 64 to read: 'Consideration should also be given to facilitating the



Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				community function of the site, and retaining a police presence if feasible and viable, in the face of any new development.'
1520	Para. 69	<b>Comment</b>	Police need to be visible in the high street - Especially in light of recent events of violent crime	This is not within the scope of the Brief and is a decision to be made by Essex Police. However, suggest an additional sentence is added to paragraph 68 to read: 'The community consultation events held during the development of this Brief highlighted the local community's desire to retain a police presence on the site or in the centre of Leigh. It is not yet established however whether the use of the building as a police station is likely to be on-going and this decision would need to be made by Essex Police. In light of the uncertain future of the police station use, due consideration should be given to options which both retain and remove this as the sole use of the building.'
1521	Para. 73	<b>Support</b>	Agree the 'connections' building should be removed and if re-established, must do so in an aesthetically pleasing way in line with surrounding heritage sites.	Noted.
1523	Para. 83	<b>Support</b>	No decked parking - would be a grave mistake and completely out of character	Noted.
1526	Para. 95	<b>Object</b>	Affordable housing would not be in keeping with the area and would be better served within the London Road facility especially so close to Leigh Broadway which could create a new set of issues including anti-social behaviour etc. Most importantly it would not be line with the heritage sights surrounding the area and residents house which back onto the site.	Affordable housing on the site would, in principle, need to be brought forward in line with police CP8 of the Core Strategy, which supports a good and well-integrated blend of different housing types and tenures to support and assist the establishment and continuance of vibrant and cohesive communities. The

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				'affordable housing' definition includes a range of tenures, including key-worker provision, and it is not considered that the provision of affordable housing on the site would be at odds with the aspirations of the Brief to provide an enhanced, mixed-use site, for Leigh.
1507	<b>Question 1</b>	<b>Comment</b>	Yes key land uses have been identified. Neighbours have tolerated community centre events but must be mindful of noise due to close proximity to residential houses.	Suggest amendment to paragraph 31 to read: 'It was noted during the consultation process that the use of the community centre for public events, concerts and large gatherings is well established and tolerated by the majority of existing neighbours. <b>Nonetheless, the amenity of these existing neighbours must be consideration for future use of the Centre and wider site.'</b>
1511	<b>Question 2</b>	<b>Support</b>	Yes relevant issues have been identified but must acknowledge that any 'events' must take into consideration the neighbouring residents - how will it be policed to stop undue noise or anti-social activities already experienced in the area.	Noted.
1515	<b>Question 3</b>	<b>Object</b>	Any 'development' must be aesthetically pleasing from residents gardens which back on the site and not built directly on the borders at the end of residents gardens.	Paragraph 62 highlights that due consideration needs to be given to the amenity of neighbouring residential buildings in terms of the scale and massing of any new development, inter-visibility between habitable rooms will be expected to be appropriately addressed, new development will need to take into account impacts on daylight and sunlight, and care should be given to the relationship which new buildings establish with existing adjoining gardens. It is considered that the issue of

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				residential amenity is therefore appropriately addressed within the Brief.
1514	<b>Question 3</b>	<b>Object</b>	Agree that this would be a viable option but need to be careful regarding 'other activities' which could create noise to residents who back onto the site. Also 12 Lymington's access to the rear must not be impacted which i see has been taken into consideration below. New Development must not negatively impact neighbouring gardens - limited to 2 story height/no loss of light/not overlooking gardens/ in keeping with the Leigh heritage. Should not include council housing.	<p>In regards to uses and noise amendments to paragraph 31 are outlined within the Council's response to consultation response 1507 above.</p> <p>Amendments are proposed to paragraphs 59 and 60 of the Brief, as outlined in the Council's response to consultation comments 1513 above.</p> <p>Paragraph 62 of the Brief deals with ensuring a sensitive and appropriate approach is taken to minimise impact on existing and adjoining residents from new development.</p> <p>Affordable housing (rather than 'council housing) provision would need to be in accordance with Policy CP8 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy.</p>
1524	<b>Question 5</b>	<b>Support</b>	Yes this is appropriate but must be done so that, 12 Lymington Avenues access to the rear is not impeded. A square feel must be done so in line neighbouring resident's interests - not an area for loitering outside of 'activities' which would impact neighbours. Also while activities are taking place, where do people park when the car park is out of action?	Noted.
1525	<b>Question 6</b>	<b>Object</b>	Residential housing must not be close to gardens backing onto the site. No flats/no taller than 2 levels in height in line with houses that back on. Must not be a new development 'eye sore' cropping up more and more in Leigh thus diluting the character. Services provided within development must be in line with resident's views. No council housing/association renting - development	<p>Paragraph 62 of the Brief deals with ensuring a sensitive and appropriate approach is taken to minimise impact on existing and adjoining residents from new development.</p> <p>Affordable housing provision would need to be provided in accordance with Policy CP8 of the</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			must be in character of Leigh. If residential areas included within the site there would be a likeliness congestion in the car park outside hours and thus impacting neighbouring residents.	Council's adopted Core Strategy.
<b>Highways Agency – Lorraine Grant</b>				
1527	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>Comment</b>	I can confirm the Highways Agency has no comment to add.	Noted.
<b>Mr Tony Carr</b>				
1549	<b>Para. 68</b>	<b>Comment</b>	Comment on flawed conditions of consultation. I consider the lack of decision on the removal of the Police Station, or not, in the long term to prevent an overall comprehensive scheme to be planned - so this issue must be resolved for the long term. Before - any comprehensive plan is proposed. The Police Authority should be pressured into a firm decision urgently.	This is not within the scope of the Brief and refers to a decision to be taken by Essex Police. <b>Comments have however been passed to the Council's Asset Management team (23.05.13) to note.</b>
<b>Mrs Annabel Clark</b>				
1556	<b>Para. 62.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	Section 6 (p26) - The western boundary is a hotch potch of different building materials including feather board fencing on top of ugly concrete slabs. If option 2 goes ahead which I hope does then it will pay to have more substantial boundary erected which is pleasing to the eye and blends with the gardens that back onto the western side and the planned trees in the car park. Please acknowledge my feedback as the website is a nightmare to access although I tried with thanks.	The comments are noted however the western boundary of the site comprises private boundaries to residential properties on Lymington Avenue that are not within the parameters of the Brief.
1550	<b>Question 1</b>	<b>Support</b>	yes key issues identified.	Noted.

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
1551	Question 2	Support	yes	Noted.
1552	Question 3	Support	yes	Noted.
1553	Question 4	Support	yes ref: spaces and frontages - western side, 57: please inform me of which properties may acquire a little more garden space through the re-alignment of the car park boundary - thank you	This is considered to be outside the parameters of the Brief. The purpose of the Brief is to guide and manage development proposals on the site, it does not constitute an implementation plan or development proposals. As development proposals come forward there may be more detailed information available, but at this stage any potential re-alignment of boundaries cannot be confirmed. <b>Comments have been passed to the Council's Asset Management team however.</b>
1554	Question 5	Support	yes no lesser spaces as Lymington Avenue is already heavily used by all day parkers who work in Leigh. Could the car parking be made cheaper to encourage them to use the car park. Preferably households to have a parking permit.	The Brief allows for the retention of the existing number of spaces, with potential for a slight increase. <b>Comments have been passed to the parking management team.</b>
1555	Question 6	Support	yes allows flexibility for the future years to come	Noted.
<b>Mrs Pat Holden</b>				
1540	Para. 59	Comment	We think outside seating areas would enhance the ambience and setting of any development and a walkway to Rectory Grove would be an advantage if this could be provided in a safe and convenient manner.	The Brief recognises at paragraph 60 that there is an opportunity to create a north-south link from the site to Rectory Grove using the existing lane alongside the telecoms exchange building. This would however need to be subject to review with BT as to existing operational requirements, and the detailed exploration of this is outside the scope of this Brief but could be further progressed as the site

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				comes forward for redevelopment.
1539	Para. 69	<b>Comment</b>	We consider there is scope for the Police Station to house other uses as well which could refocus the activity of the building and negate the claims in the Brief of lack of activity on the Elm Road frontage.	Paragraph 69 of the Brief notes that the building should remain and the preferred approach would be to see it retained in some use which permits public access and use of the building, which is compatible with the location, to include an active frontage on Elm Road and within the site. These comments have therefore been considered within the Brief.
1541	Para. 70	<b>Comment</b>	We consider the Brief and the Borough Council have failed to acknowledge the success of the Community Centre and the place it plays in the life of Leigh, and that a great opportunity to provide a significant gateway to the Town is being missed.	In regard to the paragraphs relating to the Community Centre more specifically (paragraphs 70-3) these are not intended to demean the community centre, but rather to provide an appraisal of its current form, highlighting the scale of the building and the current access arrangements. It is suggested that paragraph 70 is updated to read: 'The Community Centre is a large and relatively complex building. There is a ramp from the street to the reception area, and access is made possible to the first floor by lift however more generally, accessibility is impeded by small changes of level throughout the Centre.' It is suggested that paragraph 71 is updated in light of Leigh Town Council's management of the centre to read: 'The Centre is, in its current form, being managed for a 5-year period from August 2012 by Leigh Town Council who are promoting its continued community use for a range of functions, including the Town Council Offices.'

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
1533	Question 1	Object	<p>(a)The Town Council considers that the Brief and the Borough Council have completely placed the wrong emphasis on the status of the site and therefore their focus is based on a false premise. The Brief places the site in a south to north context in that it sees it as a transition area between the commercial and residential parts of the Town.</p> <p>(b)The Town Council is firmly of the view that the orientation should be north to south and that this site is not a transition area at all but a gateway to the Town and is therefore of much greater significance than implied and should be treated as such. Due to this misconception the site is dealt with as a subsidiary area and not seen as a focal point in the town. The Community Centre is also framed as a striking focal point at the west end of Pall Mall - good enough to feature on the cover of the Brief!</p>	<p>(a) + (b) the site is within the boundary of the District Centre and is designated as secondary shopping frontage (an approach taken forward by the Borough Local Plan (1994) and progressed within the emerging Development Management DPD following a review of these designations) – the boundary of these designations terminate to the northern boundary of the site subject of this Brief. The Brief acknowledges this and it is the Council's view that this is an appropriate response to the descriptive analysis of the site, as confirmed by the designations within the Development Plan. It is suggested that for purposes of clarification a plan is included within Section 2, together with supporting text, which clarifies the designations on the site (secondary shopping frontage, locally listed building, and district centre).</p>
1533	Question 1	Object	<p>(c)The civic nature of the site is played down, in the reference to it being 'nominally' public buildings when in fact it has been at the civic centre of the Town for over 100 years and was obviously planned as such by the development of the Town Council offices, police station, former fire station site and community centre during the same period. The Town Council's view is that it should be so again and the Brief fails to recognise the significance of the site to the Town and residents.</p>	<p>(c) For purposes of clarification it is suggested that paragraph 26 is updated so that 'nominally' is omitted.</p> <p>This comment relates to paragraph 29 where the reference is made to the civic/public function of the majority of buildings on the site to highlight that despite this, the level of active frontage is limited. It is considered that the Brief clearly outlines an opportunity for the enhancement of these buildings, as set out</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
				within paragraph 30 which states that 'the majority of the land use within the site is public or civic.' Furthermore, the Council considers that the history of the site and the buildings within it is sufficiently outlined within paragraphs 7-11.
1533	<b>Question 1</b>	<b>Object</b>	(d) Whilst the 1999 proposals map shows the area as a secondary shopping frontage including the CC, this must have been a. Even Kelly's Directory for 1963 shows no retail north of no 55 Elm Road, after which there is a Southend Corporation office and a Registrar's office as well as those uses mentioned above - very much a civic site.	(d) It should be noted that the secondary shopping frontage designation, from a planning perspective, doesn't simply relate to retail development. As the BLP (Saved Policy S5 Non-retail uses) states there will generally be no discrimination between shops and non-retail uses falling within class A2 (financial and professional services) and A3 (restaurants and cafes).
1533	<b>Question 1</b>	<b>Object</b>	(e) The buildings are not underused as is implied and the Town Council is fast turning the Centre into a thriving hub of the community. The Centre is not 'tolerated' it is actively supported by the Town, including existing neighbours.	(e) Noted. The Town Council's management of the Centre has largely evolved since the public consultation events and drafting of the Brief. Amendments suggested to paragraph 71 to update the Brief in light of the current situation.
1533	<b>Question 1</b>	<b>Object</b>	(f) In addition the Town Council has serious queries against the desirability for extra car parking in the Town. There are car parks which are underused - the issue is cost of parking, not availability.	(f) In regards to parking, as a point of clarification, the Brief does not allocate significant levels of public car parking. Indeed, the Brief seeks to replace and upgrade the existing parking provision (and may result in a slight increase).
			(g)The Town Council considers that the Brief has failed to add any vibrancy to the site in terms of the form and content of development it proposes. This has been lost by the overpowering 'need' for more parking. There are other solutions to the parking issue which should be	(g) See response to (f) above



Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			investigated and a site of this site and importance should not be focussed around car parking.	
			(h)The Town Council notes the modest scale of the buildings in the area and this should not be breached in any proposed development. (The south side could go a little higher to the north of the BT building - this wouldn't affect the sunlight or residents)	(h) Noted.
			(i)Also the Brief gives scant reference to planting. This is a very important element and needs to be considered sensitively especially with a dual use area. A tree here and there is not landscaping.	(i) The existing levels of planting are considered in detail at paragraphs 27-29. In terms of the future development of the site, the opportunities for planting is first outlined in paragraph 52, which is further developed at paragraph 65. This includes the potential for tree planting to Elm Road frontage, tree planting to the central space, structured planting to the rear of the site particularly to the boundaries with existing gardens, and opportunities for planting at ground level (including lawn and planting beds) in various locations. The detailed design would be determined as part of any development proposal that came forward for the site through the planning process. This Brief would be a material consideration in the design making process, but the purposes of the Brief is not to stipulate a detailed design for the development of the site.
1533	<b>Question 1</b>	<b>Object</b>	(j) Significantly the Brief fails to properly reference the Town Council's occupancy of a major part of the site, the Community Centre. This is clearly reflected in the total	(j) In regard to the reference by the Objector to the studies which informed the Brief it is presumed that this reference is made to the

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			<p>misunderstanding in the Brief and generally by the Borough Council, of the reality of the use of the Centre. The studies which informed the Brief were done well before the Town Council took over the Centre and reflect a position which does not now exist. The Centre is now, and is increasingly, becoming the focal point of reference for Leigh and the Brief fails to address this - it is suggested that the Borough Council needs to review the Brief in the light of this so that it truly reflects the situation of the Community Centre into the future. The people of Leigh value this site and buildings which give them a sense of place and all are concerned that the architecture and buildings should remain. There is reference to the retention only of the facade of the Community...</p>	<p>community consultation events and viability study, the outcomes of which are included within the Brief in section 4 and 6 in particular. It is considered that the Brief properly considers the on-going community function of the community centre building, which has been taken account of in the viability work that accompanied the drafting of the Brief.</p> <p>The use of the community has indeed evolved since this time and the following wording is suggested to paragraph 71 'The Centre is, in its current form, being managed for a 5-year period from August 2012 by Leigh Town Council who are promoting its continued community use for a range of functions, including the Town Council Offices.'</p>
1534	<b>Question 2</b>	<b>Object</b>	<p>The answers to Question 1 go in part to answer this question and should be referred to. The Town Council is deeply concerned at the Brief's failure to understand the nature of the use of the site which has moved on considerably in the last 6 months and which is set to improve dramatically in the next few years with the enhanced use of the Community Centre. It is not a conglomeration of old, dated buildings with back land car parking. It is fast becoming the social, cultural and community hub of Leigh.</p> <p>There is no recognition in the Brief of how important these buildings are to the Town despite the fact that the Borough has repeatedly been made aware of this. They</p>	<p>The Council recognises that use of the community has evolved since this time and the following wording is suggested to paragraph 71 'The Centre is, in its current form, being managed for a 5-year period from August 2012 by Leigh Town Council who are promoting its continued community use for a range of functions, including the Town Council Offices.'</p> <p>The history of the site is recognised within the brief, where it is detailed within the first section of the document in paragraph 7-9. The</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			<p>are familiar to, and feature in the experiences of, most residents and, as such, provide a 'sense of place' considered so important by planners and psychologists. The Borough is clearly seeing this site as the 'saviour' of their problems of centralising displaced uses from other of its buildings it is disposing of.</p> <p>The Community Centre is already well-subscribed to and the space often fully utilised. The organisation of the uses and space has evolved and developed since the Town Council has taken over, and is now effective but 'comfortable'.</p> <p>The Town Council wish it to be known that it will resist vigorously any attempt by the Borough Council to centralise displaced uses within the Community Centre to the detriment of its operation and use.</p> <p>What the Town Council would favour is a sympathetic extension of the Community Centre westwards to take in the site of the Connexions building as an adjunct to the Centre where displaced uses and similar could be housed without (administrative or structural) detriment to the Community Centre as an entity. This would be able to accommodate youth uses which have been lost and which are essential to the ever? Increasing young population of Leigh; it would increase the civic hub element of the area without loss of the vital services and space the Community Centre provides.</p> <p>There is a lack of understanding in the Brief for the context of Leigh as a town. Property prices are high - people weren't to live here - part of the attraction is the lifestyle and the heritage to which scant reference is made in the Brief.</p>	<p>importance of preserving the locally listed police station is reflected throughout the document and within the development principles it establishes, as is the community centre itself, despite this building not itself being designated.</p> <p>The preferred approach, as outlined in the Brief, puts forward the potential for residential development to be brought forward in the site, although it recognises within paragraph 63 that given the sites location within the district centre of Leigh, a range of uses appropriate to this designation could be considered. In paragraph 64 the Brief highlights that consideration should also be given to facilitating the community function of the site in the face of any new development. The preferred approach was developed by the expert consultant team at AMUP and informed by viability appraisal from GL Hearn, in response to the community consultation sessions that set out aspirations for the future of the site. The Brief seeks the creation of a new central space within the site which would be framed by active frontages.</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			<p>The Town Council does not believe this site is suitable for housing as proposed - the layout proposed does not provide a suitable setting for housing - it is dead frontage and lacks any ambient variety and vibrancy to enhance the area and would be an alien feature in the desired community square. The Town Council would rather see the traditional features of Leigh in some suitable commercial small scale use with residential above on the South side. Any form of large scale retail/commercial development is totally inappropriate to Leigh and to this site.</p> <p>The Town Council also opposes opening up the front of the Community Centre to retail uses. Such a proposal would also lead to a loss of valuable community space within the Community Centre, which the Town Council will resist; display cases where there are recesses in the brick work could have lively displays relevant to the Community uses, or of art.</p>	<p>In regards to the former units to the front of the community centre building, the brief highlights how these could be brought back into use to create a greater level of active frontage onto Elm Road. The Brief does not prescribe a particular use for these units, such as retail, but is focused on the benefits of opening up these small, individual units to incorporate an active use at ground floor on Elm Road.</p>
1535	<b>Question 3</b>	<b>Object</b>	<p>The Town Council consider that the Brief projects a missed opportunity to provide a comprehensive and well thought out development of this major site within Leigh. As stated above, the focus of the Brief takes the wrong orientation for the site and the Brief it is felt is written and in such language as to deride the site, its uses and down play its importance.</p> <p>There are massive advantages to the Town of Leigh, and to the Borough, in enhancing this site. Leigh is a cultural</p>	<p>The development brief has sought to recognise the civic/public use of the site and its buildings, whilst providing a viable and sustainable approach to the retention and redevelopment of the site that would allow its public use/function to continue to prosper, together with other complementary uses to enable this (such as housing). As the Brief outlines on page 2, it does not in itself constitute an</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			<p>hub in the Borough and the Borough is failing to capitalise on that history, culture and community awareness and spirit.</p> <p>The development of the Elm Road site by the reorientation of the Community Centre entrance looking into the square, the extension of the building to accommodate more community uses, and the enhancement of the town square element flanked to the south by suitably designed properties, building on the cultural heritage and artistic community of Leigh, well landscaped and with good boundary treatments and access would be a great attraction to the Town and create a focal heart in the community. It would provide economic stimulus in the form of jobs and an enhancement to the quality of life of all the residents of Leigh. It would enhance the educational, leisure, cultural and youth facilities in Leigh and would truly be a development of and for all ages.</p>	<p>implementation plan, nor is it intended to prescribe specific phases for development. It sets out the Council's preferred approach for the site and has been formed by extensive engagement with the local community and a viability report compiled by GL Hearn. This study indicates, as outlined with the final paragraphs of the Brief, that residential development is likely to prove the most viable for the site, with a strong emphasis on houses rather than flats.</p>
1536	<b>Question 4</b>	<b>Object</b>	<p>There is a presumption that development is always an improvement - this is not necessarily the case, it depends on need and quality. We have pointed out the error in the Brief in viewing the site from the wrong orientation and thus down playing its importance. Some of the comments in Section 6 are totally erroneous in their interpretations of buildings, particularly the Community Centre, and the whole tenor of the paragraphs referring to the Community Centre seem to be written from an intentionally demeaning and devaluing stance designed, no doubt, to pave the way for some major upheaval. The Town Council takes great exception to and refutes the view given in paragraphs 70-72 and will encourage</p>	<p>'Option 5' shows a similar site layout, with the central car park/public space, although includes an extension to the community centre to the rear (in place of the houses suggested on the preferred approach within the brief). The development brief has sought to recognise the civic/public use of the site and its buildings, whilst providing a viable and sustainable approach to the retention and redevelopment of the site that would allow its public use/function to continue to prosper, together with other complementary uses to enable this (such as housing). As the Brief outlines on page</p>

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			<p>the residents of Leigh to respond that they will not accept the loss of or devaluation of the Community Centre. Indeed, it is the very non-conformity of the building that gives it the character and individuality which endears it to, and attracts, an ever-increasing number of users. Option 5 (attached), being a suggestion layout submitted by Cllr Herbert, is adopted by the Council as its preferred option for the Community Centre and northern end of the site.</p>	<p>2, it does not in itself constitute an implementation plan, nor is it intended to prescribe specific phases for development. It sets out the Council's preferred approach for the site and has been formed by extensive engagement with the local community and a viability report compiled by GL Hearn. This study indicates, as outlined with the final paragraphs of the Brief, that residential development is likely to prove the most viable for the site, with a strong emphasis on houses rather than flats.</p>
1537	<b>Question 5</b>	<b>Object</b>	<p>Despite repeated requests by the Town Council the car parks in the Town are poorly signed. This should be rectified before any idea of additional extensive car parking is considered.</p> <p>See comments above about car parking. Alternative provision such as park and ride should be considered. It is difficult to see a net gain from the parking proposed when the surrounding development's parking needs will need to be factored in. The Council will not accept any form of underground or multi storey option.</p>	<p>Comments on signage passed to Highways Management team for comment. It should be noted that the preferred option presented within the Brief does not make provision for underground or multi-storey parking on the site, nor does it make provision for additional extensive car parking. The provision of park and ride facilities is not considered to be within the scope of this brief.</p>
1538	<b>Question 6</b>	<b>Object</b>	<p>The simple answer to this question is NO - for all of the above reasons. What the Brief has missed is the essence and heart of Leigh - something perhaps only residents can explain.</p>	<p>The Brief is the outcome of extensive public consultation and has been produced to reflect the views of the community balanced with a viable approach to redevelopment of the site that will secure it long terms future.</p>
<p><b>South Essex Chapter of Architects – Mr Richard King</b></p>				

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
1542	<b>Question 1</b>	<b>Comment</b>	Whilst not intended to be reinstated it is possibly incorrect to describe the route through from Lymington Avenue as a "historic lane". It was not, it was merely the rear access sideway to Green's Builders yard in Elm Road from which there was another access.	Debee – please reallocated to paragraph 13. Suggested amendments to bullet point 3 to read: <a href="#">22 Lymington Avenue adjoins a historic access route linking the body of the site through to Lymington Avenue.....</a>
1543	<b>Question 2</b>	<b>Comment</b>	At the consultation the need to examine the provision of "affordable" housing and/ workspaces was raised as lacking in Leigh and that this is one of the few sites that might address this. No reference is made.	Reference is made to affordable housing provision within paragraph 95 of the Brief whereby the policy requirement of Core Strategy Policy CP8 are stipulated.
1545	<b>Question 3</b>	<b>Comment</b>	a) No. See Q2 - b) Although brief reference is made in later sections of the report, all of the options described appear to include retention of the community centre in its entirety with community usage. This is not therefore a thorough option appraisal and could mislead the public and cause discontent at a later date. When questioned on financial viability at the consultation the town clerk advised that the business plan showed a projected gap of @£80k p.a. which they would seek to cover by income from bookings. In the event this has not proven to the basis instead of which a higher than inflation increase in LTC Council tax has been introduced. This indicates that the community usage may not be financially viable and self-sufficient in the long term both in terms of capital and revenue. Refer to Page 32 in the brief. It is important that proposals have a	The 4 options described within this section relate to the work developed during the community consultation event. Options 3 and 4 suggest how the community centre building could be adapted, both highlighting the potential for the frontage of the community centre to be opened up for other uses. These options do not indicate that the building will be wholly preserved in its current form but do recognise its contribution in terms of community use. For clarification, paragraph 46 can be further amended at bullet point 3 to read: 'There is an expectation that there would need to be <a href="#">significant</a> investment in the <a href="#">community centre</a> building to achieve a consolidation of uses.'
1546	<b>Question 4</b>	<b>Comment</b>	The statement in Para 63 page 26 is wrong in that along the Broadway and Rectory Grove residential development is closely integrated with the town centre which makes it one of the desirable features of Leigh. There are a number of places where the report makes	The premise of this statement is unclear. The Brief does not dismiss the potential for residential development on the site, it includes it as a preferred approach. The description of the site within paragraph 63 describes how the

Rep No	Policy or para	Object/ Support	Summary of Rep	Council's Response
			conflicting statements within the brief but it is fundamentally wrong to dismiss residential development in this way.	location and designations suggest that a range of uses could be accommodated that support the link between the commercial centre and the wider area which is more residential in character.
1547	<b>Question 5</b>	<b>Support</b>	Yes. Although stated in the brief that there would not be any loss of parking and if anything a slight increase the Approach 2 diagram on page 22 shows development on the area behind the police station which is currently parking. In addition since the consultation there are now events at the community centre which result in it being full by 11.45 on some Sundays.	Noted.
1548	<b>Question 6</b>	<b>Comment</b>	We believe that this is a matter for the officers to satisfy themselves that the framework can deliver a high quality of design in buildings and public space that is so often lacking in Southend	Noted.