

**Southend Central Area Action Plan (SCAAP) Revised Proposed
Submission
Consultation Statement - Regulation 19**

September 2016

Contents

Section 1	Introduction
Section 2	Consultation under Regulation 19 Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (2015) <i>Table 1: Consultation Methods (Carried out during Southend Central Area action Plan Preferred Approach Consultation)</i> <i>Table 2: Type of Representations Received during the Consultation Period (18th December 2015 to 15th February 2016) on the Preferred Approach</i> <i>Table 3: Type of Comments Received at Workshops Held on 20th and 21st January 2016</i>
Section 3	Key Issues Identified
Section 4	Consultation under Regulation 19 Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach
Section 5	Statement of Fact – details of the Preferred Approach Consultation
Appendix 1	Consultees (Preferred Approach Stage, December 2015)
Appendix 2	Copy of Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (December 2015) Consultation Material
Appendix 3	Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (2015) – Detailed Summary of Representations Received during the Consultation Period (18th December 2015 to 15 th February 2016)
Appendix 4	Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (2015) – Detailed Summary of Workshop Comments Held on 20 th and 21 st January 2016
Appendix 5	Summary of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (December 2015)

Section 1: Introduction

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared to comply with the requirements of Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulation 2012.
- 1.2 This Consultation Statement provides a summary of the representations received on the Preferred Approach version of the Southend Central Area Action Plan (SCAAP) published in November 2015.
- 1.3 The process of producing the Southend Central Area Action Plan (SCAAP) has been informed by a number of public consultation events, namely:
 - Town Centre Area Action Plan Issues and Options 2007
 - Seafront Area Action Plan Issues and options version 2007
 - Central Area Masterplan 2007
 - SCAAP Issues and Options June 2010
 - SCAAP (Superseded) Proposed Submission September 2011
 - SCAAP Preferred Approach November 2015
- 1.4 Earlier SCAAP consultation statements published in December 2015 and September 2011, available on the Council's website, summarise the representations of these earlier events: www.southend.gov.uk/scaap.

Section 2: Consultation under Regulation 19 Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (2015)

- 2.1 The Southend Central Area Action Plan (SCAAP) Preferred Approach was published so that representations could be made between 18th December 2015 and 15th February 2016. This was extremely valuable and provided the Council with a number of helpful suggestions that would then improve the plan.
- 2.2 The Preferred Approach consultation was carried out in line with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2013) and relevant planning regulations. During the 8 week consultation the plan was publicised in the local press, the council's website www.southend.gov.uk/scaap and was available to view at the Council offices and all local libraries. Consultation response forms were also available.
- 2.3 **Appendix 1** set outs the list of consultees contacted and **Appendix 2** sets out a copy of the consultation material used during the Preferred Approach publication period. **Table 1** below sets out details of the consultation methods used to engage the resident and business community in the preparation of the Preferred Approach version of the Southend Central Area Action Plan.
- 2.4 In total 33 organisations and individuals made 543 representations on the Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach. However, one such submission represented the views of over fifty businesses located within the central seafront area. Of the 543 duly made representations, 44 were considered as 'objections' to the plan and 157 supported the plan or parts of it. There were also 342 general comments. There were no 'not duly made' representations received.
- 2.5 **Table 2** below summarises the type of representations made on the Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach. A detailed summary of the 543 representations received and the Council's response to these is set out in **Appendix 3**.
- 2.6 In addition to these representations received, a further 400 comments were made by organisations and individuals on the Preferred Approach following the holding of a series of workshops as part of the consultation methods used. A number of those making comments also made written representations on the Plan.
- 2.7 The workshops were held on 20th and 21st January 2016 at Park Inn, Palace Hotel located within the plan area. The workshops sought to further engage the local business community and local residents and included a detailed look at the proposed Policy Areas as outlined in the SCAAP. Six separate sessions were held over the two days. Two each were targeted at specific groups, namely local businesses, the local community and Southend elected Members.
- 2.8 **Table 3** below summarises the type of representations made at the workshops whilst **Appendix 4** provides a detailed summary of the comments and the Council's response to these.

Table 1: Consultation Methods (Carried out during Southend Central Area action Plan Preferred Approach Consultation)

Method	Action Taken
Direct Consultation with Specific, General and Other Consultees including hardcopies/electronic copies of the consultation document where appropriate	Letter sent on 18 th December 2015 to all contacts on the LDF database to inform them that the SCAAP Preferred Approach consultation document was published for consultation. The database contains 700 consultees representing Specific, General and Other Consultees.
	Hard copies of the document were printed and made available on request.
	Letters and hard copies of the SCAAP Preferred Approach consultation document were sent to all of the Southend-on-Sea Borough Councillors on 18 th , 21 st December and 15 th 20 th January 2016.
	Letters were sent to all residents living within or adjacent to the Opportunity Sites set out within the SCAAP Preferred Approach version on 13 th January 2016.
	An email was sent to all of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council's Corporate Directors informing them of Consultation and requesting dedicated officer for a response. Hard Copies were supplied on request.
	An email was sent to the Southend Tourism Partnership informing them of the consultation and public workshops.
	An email was sent to the BID partnership informing them of the consultation and public workshops.
Inspection copies were made available at all of the public libraries in the Borough and at the Civic Centre	Copies of the SCAAP Preferred Approach consultation document with posters and leaflets were placed at all libraries and Council Offices on 18 th December 2015.
Publish on the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council website	The SCAAP Preferred Approach consultation document was published on the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council website with a JDi on line consultation facility and ability to download document on 18 th December 2015. Information was provided on how to obtain hard copies and/or view at deposit points.
	Leaflets produced providing advice on the on-line consultation system and left at deposit points/exhibitions.
Publication of Newsletters and/or Leaflets as appropriate	21 st December 2015 consultation leaflets were printed advertising the public consultation workshops (see below).
	Poster and Leaflets deposited at all Doctors Surgeries on 21 st December 2015 in order to potentially target some of the harder to reach groups.
	Consultation information included within the Southend Business Partnership Newsletter, January 2015, and published on the Business on Sea website.
Press Release + newspaper notice	Press Release to local papers issued 18 December 2015 and 14 January 2016. Supported by Twitter and Facebook activity.
	Advert about public consultation and information about public workshop event in Town Centre (see below) placed in local press on Friday 15 th and 22 nd January 2016 [Yellow Advertiser].
Banners	Banners placed in the Civic Centre and at The Forum (public library in the Town Centre) on 18 th December 2015.
Area Forums/ Workshops/ Presentations	Public consultation workshop in Park Inn Palace Hotel on 20 th and 21 st January 2016 to target Residents, Business and Elected Councillors.
	Informed the BID Committee on 14 th January 2016 about the SCAAP Preferred Approach document.
Community Groups	Letter sent on 18 th December 2015 to all on LDF database to inform that the SCAAP Preferred Approach consultation document is published for consultation – includes comprehensive coverage of resident / tenants / community associations and societies across the Borough.
Councillors	Local Development Framework Working Party briefed about consultation on the SCAAP Preferred Approach consultation document on 15 th September 2015.
	An email was sent to all of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council's Councillors informing them of Consultation, Drop-in Sessions and Workshops on 18 th , 21 st December 2015, with follow-up emails sent on

Method	Action Taken
Feedback form to assess effectiveness of engagement activity	15 th and 20 th January 2016. Hard Copies were supplied on request.
	Councillor Drop-in sessions 20 th and 21 st January 2016.
	<p data-bbox="580 170 1468 232">The Council's online system for making representations also includes an equalities feedback form.</p> <p data-bbox="580 232 1468 362">Document placed on the Council's website (www.southend.gov.uk) for inspection and downloading. The Borough Council encourage comments online via our E-Consultation service in order to make commenting on documents easier and straightforward.</p>

Table 2: Summary of Representations Received during the Consultation Period (18th December 2015 and 15th February 2016) on the Preferred Approach

Total individual respondents was 33

Southend Central Area Action Plan DPD	Support	Object	Comment	Total Responses
Section 1 - Introduction				
Question 1: SA	0	0	1	1
Question 2: Policies Map	1	1	2	4
Section 2 - Visions and Objections				
Question 3: Vision	4	1	5	10
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	16	0	4	20
Section 3 - Central Area Strategy				
Question 5: Central Area Strategy	6	0	3	9
Section 4 - Criteria Based Policies				
Question 6: Policy DS1 Retail	10	3	25	38
Question 7: Policy Options DS1a, DS1b, DS1c	3	1	4	8
Question 8: Employment Section	6	0	1	7
Question 9: Housing Allocation of residential sites with planning permission	1	0	0	1
Question 10: Housing Section	8	0	7	15
Question 11: Culture, Leisure, Tourism & Recreation Section	3	2	4	9
Question 12: Historic Environment Section	7	1	6	14
Question 13: Open and Green Space section	5	0	3	8
Question 14: Policy DS2: Key Views	6	0	2	8
Question 15: Policy DS3: Landmarks and Landmark Buildings	2	2	3	7
Question 16: Policy DS4: Floodrisk, SuDS	2	0	5	7
Question 17: Policy DS5: Transport, Access, Public Realm	6	13	46	65
Question 18: Infrastructure Section	4	0	9	13
Section 5 - Policy Areas and Site Allocations				
Question 19: Site Allocation Indicative Capacity Table	0	1	0	1
Question 20: Policy PA1 High Street	9	1	24	34
Question 21: Policy PA2 London Road	4	4	23	31
Question 22: Policy PA3 Elmer	3	0	7	10
Question 23: Policy PA4 Queensway	3	0	11	14
Question 24: Policy PA5 Warrior Sq	1	0	13	14
Question 25: Policy PA6 Clifftown	6	2	16	24
Question 26: Policy PA7 Tylers	2	0	16	18
Question 27: Policy CS1 Central Seafront	22	7	45	74
Question 28: Policy CS2 Nature Conservation & Biodiversity	1	0	3	4
Question 29: Policy CS3 Waterfront	2	0	3	5
Question 30: Policy PA8 Victoria Gateway	3	2	18	23
Question 31: Policy PA9 Sutton Gateway	3	1	4	8
Section 6 - Delivery of the SCAAP				
Question 32: Phasing of Development Table	1	1	1	3
Question 33: Useful to include indicative figures for potential development in this section	1	0	0	1
Question 34: Useful to set out a series of projects and tasks for the Plan – linked to funding	1	0	0	1
Question 35: Overall approach for the Implementation Plan	1	0	1	2
Question 36: Monitoring Framework	1	0	0	1
Question 37: General Comments	3	1	27	31
Total	157	44	342	543

Table 3: Type of Comments Received at Workshops Held on 20th and 21st January 2016

Policy Area/Representation		PA1: High Street	PA2: London Road	PA3: Elmer Square	PA4: Queens way	PA5: Warrior Square	PA6: Clifftown	PA7: Tylers	CS1: Central Seafront	PA8: Victoria Gateway	PA9: Sutton Gateway	Total
Support/ Like	Total	9	14	8	9	4	8	16	20	8	2	98
	Public	6	3	8	0	3	6	10	12	7	0	55
	Business	0	4	0	2	1	1	4	7	1	0	20
	Member	3	7	0	7	0	1	2	1	0	2	23
What is Missing	Total	12	4	8	6	3	7	4	17	7	0	68
	Public	7	1	6	4	3	4	3	5	7	0	40
	Business	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	16
	Member	2	2	2	2	0	3	0	1	0	0	12
What can be Improved	Total	36	18	7	12	17	12	14	45	24	11	196
	Public	19	14	4	9	8	9	10	25	16	5	119
	Business	7	1	1	2	3	0	2	14	5	0	35
	Member	10	3	2	1	6	3	2	6	3	6	42
Other Issues	Total	5	5	4	4	2	3	1	8	6	0	38
	Public	2	4	2	4	2	3	0	8	2	0	27
	Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	4
	Member	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7
Total	Total	62	41	27	31	26	30	35	90	45	13	400
	Public	34	22	20	17	16	22	23	50	32	5	241
	Business	10	6	1	4	4	1	8	32	9	0	75
	Member	18	13	6	10	6	7	4	8	4	8	84

Section 3: Key Issues Identified

- 3.1 The following information provides a list of some of the main issues raised by the representations on the preferred approach of the Plan and each of its policy provisions as part of the consultation process, including the workshops held with the local business and resident community and elected Members. This list is not intended to be exhaustive.
- 3.2 **Appendix 3** of this report provides a summary of each duly made representation and **Appendix 4** details those comments made at the workshops.
- 3.3 **Appendices 3 and 4** also provide a summary of how the Council responded to the issues raised through consultation on the Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach.
- 3.4 The following information provides a list of some of the issues raised by the representations on each proposed policy. This list is not intended to be exhaustive. Appendix 3 of this report provides a summary of each representation made. Full comments made during the consultation on the Preferred Approach can be viewed here: <http://southend.idi-consult.net/localplan/>

General Approach:

- Vision, Strategic Objectives and Strategy well supported
- Approach to employment development supported
- Residential development in central area supported
- Approach to culture, leisure, tourism, historic environment and open space generally well supported
- Concern regarding lack of emphasis in Plan on importance of tourism to Southend and the importance of the areas historic past
- Need to ensure high quality design in new developments

Policy DS1: Maintaining a Prosperous Retail Centre

- Support for maintaining High Street as a prosperous sub-regional centre
- Recognition that High Street needs to adapt to changing retail patterns and be more flexible in its approach and diversity to encourage restaurants, cafes and similar uses

Policy DS2: Key Views

- Policy provisions well supported

Policy DS3: Landmarks and Landmark Buildings

- Provisions welcomed but also concern that places emphasis on landmark buildings rather than best quality design

Policy DS4: Flood Risk Management and Sustainable Drainage

- Policy provisions welcomed
- Concerns raised regarding surface water disposal – policy changes proposed as a result

Policy DS5: Transport Access and Public Realm

- Provisions for sustainable transport welcomed
- Concern that additional residential development should make adequate provision for residents car parking
- Need to maintain car parking capacity at a level that supports the vitality and viability of centre
- Problems of accessibility to centre and limited car parking provision preventing further investment in tourism facilities
- Need for additional car parking provision in central seafront tourist areas
- Congestion/poor accessibility resulting in shoppers/visitors not returning to town

- Should be like for like car parking provision on Opportunity Sites which are currently used for car parking with additional provision for development proposed on site
- Concern whether 'mixed mode' transport provision is safe
- Needs of vulnerable road users, cyclists and motor cyclists must be taken into full account
- Road safety/connectivity improvements needed through improved road crossing facilities

Policy PA1: High Street

- Policy provisions generally supported
- Recognition of need to improve public realm, landscaping etc to create a quality pedestrian environment
- Need to improve signage and wayfinding
- Need to improve connectivity, particularly to seafront
- Need to improve High Street offer

Policy PA2: London Road

- Need to improve Victoria Circus
- No retail frontage to Queensway
- Pedestrianisation generally welcomed but concerns about mobility issues

Policy PA3: Elmer Square

- Policy provisions welcomed

Policy PA4: Queensway

- Policy provisions generally welcomed
- Concerns regarding road safety and access

Policy PA5: Warrior Square

- Need to improve connectivity and enhance urban greening

Policy PA6: Clifftown

- General support for policy provisions
- Concerns raised regarding traffic movement in area
- Need for greater consideration to be given to future use of Empire Theatre site
- Need for better connectivity to railway station

Policy PA7: Tylers

- Support for the relocation of the Travel Centre
- Need for better connectivity and facilities at Travel Centre
- Need for improved linkages to High Street and Seafront

Policy CS1: Central Seafront

- Good support for policy provisions
- Concerns relating to adequacy of car parking in area to support tourism facilities and level of traffic in area
- Need for improved signage and connectivity to High Street and surrounding areas
- Need to ensure Seaway Opportunity Site provides a quality gateway to the seafront
- Concerns regarding heights of buildings in new development

Policy CS2: Nature Conservation and Biodiversity

- Policy wording not considered adequate –policy changes proposed

Policy CS3: The Waterfront

- Policy provisions generally supported

Policy PA8: Victoria Gateway

- Regeneration of area welcomed
- Need to make adequate provision for residential parking
- Consideration should be given to school and health needs
- Improve connectivity to High Street
- Concern regarding potential redevelopment of Roots Hall Football Ground resulting in out of town retail development to detriment of central area
- Baxter Avenue site should be allocated as Opportunity Site – now proposed to be included

Policy PA9: Sutton Road

- General support for regeneration of area
- Guildford Road site should be allocated as Opportunity Site – now proposed to be included

Section 4: Consultation under Regulation 19 Southend Central Area Action Plan (Revised Proposed Submission Document)

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) Town and County Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012: Regulation 19

- 4.1 Southend-on-Sea Borough Council has prepared a Revised Proposed Submission version of the Southend Central Area Action Plan (SCAAP) as part of its Local Planning Framework, which it proposes to submit to the Secretary of State under Regulation 22 of the above Regulations.
- 4.2 The SCAAP Revised Proposed Submission updates the Preferred Approach version of the document (published December 2015), taking into account representations made and additional evidence.
- 4.3 The SCAAP (Revised Proposed Submission Document) and accompanying documents have been published in order for representations to be made prior to the submission of the Southend Central Area Action Plan to the Secretary of State for independent examination.
- 4.4 The Plan sets out detailed policies for a wide range of issues for the Central Area of the town, against which planning applications will be assessed, including shopping, housing, transport and the natural environment. It also identifies a number of Opportunity Sites for development. These will replace a number of Saved Policies from the 1994 Borough Local Plan.
- 4.5 Representations can be made during the publication period which begins on **26th October 2016** and ends on **5pm 9th December 2016**.
- 4.6 Only representations received during this consultation period will be considered. Late responses will not be accepted.
- 4.7 Representations must relate to 'soundness' and legal compliance, and should be made using the Council's online interactive consultation system, which can be found at <http://southend.jdi-consult.net/ldf/>. Alternatively, representations may be submitted using the Response Form, available on request, by the following means:
 - e-mail to ldf@southend.gov.uk or
 - in writing to the Corporate Director, Department for Place, PO Box 557, Civic Centre, Victoria Avenue, Southend-on-Sea, SS2 6ZF.

Section 5: Statement of Fact - details of the Preferred Approach Consultation

5.1 The Revised Proposed Submission Southend Central Area Action Plan, Revised Policies Map and accompanying documents, alongside a statement setting out how representations can be made, are available for inspection from **26th October 2016 to 9th December 2016** at the following locations:

- Southend Council's website: www.southend.gov.uk/scaap
- Southend Borough Council Contact Centre, Civic Centre, Victoria Avenue, Southend on Sea between 8.45am and 5.15pm (Monday to Friday); and
- All Southend Libraries during normal opening hours:
 - Southend Forum, Elmer Square, Southend
 - Southchurch Library, Lifstans Way, Southend
 - Kent Elms Library, Prince Avenue, Leigh
 - Thorpedene Library, Delaware Road, Shoebury
 - Friars Library, The Renown, Shoebury
 - Westcliff Library, London Road, Westcliff
 - Leigh Library, Broadway West, Leigh

5.2 Hard copies can be purchased for **£5 by contacting the Business Intelligence Unit by telephone on 01702 215004 ext. 5408 or email ldf@southend.gov.uk**

Appendix 1: Consultees (Preferred Approach Stage, December 2015)

LDF 2016 - Specific Consultees (ALL)

Organisation

Aldi Foodstore Ltd

AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UK Ltd

Anglian Water Services

Arriva Southern Counties

Arriva Southern Counties Ltd

Asda Superstores

Barling Magna Parish Council

Basildon Borough Council

British Wind Energy Association

BUPA Wellesley Hospital

c2c Rail & National Express East Anglia

CAA Safety Regulation Group

Castle Point Borough Council

CPREssex

Dartford Borough Council

Defence Infrastructure Organisation

East of England Ambulance Service

EDF Energy

EDF Energy (Renewables)

EE

English Heritage East of England

Environment Agency

Environment Agency

Environment Agency

Essex Chambers of Commerce - South Essex Office

Essex Council Council

Essex County Council

Essex County Council

Essex County Council

Organisation

Essex Fire & Rescue Service HQ

Essex Police

Essex Police

Essex Police Community Safety Dept

Essex Police, Headquarters

Essex Wildlife Trust

First Essex Buses Ltd

Foulness Parish Council

Friends, Families & Travellers & Travellers Law Reform Project Community Base

Great Wakering Parish Council

Guide Dogs for the Blind Association

H M Customs & Excise

Highways Agency

Highways Agency (Network Strategy)

Highways England

Historic England

Hockley Parish Council

Leigh Town Council

London Southend Airport

MOA (Mobile Operators Association)

National Grid

Natural England

Natural England Consultation Service

NHS England, Essex Area Team,

Planning Potential on behalf of Aldi Stores Ltd

Public Health

QinetiQ

Resident Association Watch

Rochford District Council

Rochford Parish Council

South East Local Enterprise Partnership

Southend University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust

SPORT ENGLAND

The Draughtsman

Organisation

The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups

The National Trust

The Planning Inspectorate

The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings

Three

Thurrock Council

Thurrock Unitary Council

Town Centre Partnership

Traveller Law Reform

UK Power Network

University of Essex

Vodafone and O2

LDF - General Consultees (ALL)

Organisation

A W Squier Ltd

AC Taxis

Age Concern

Arriva Southern Counties Ltd

Association of Jewish Refugees

Barton Wilmore

Belfairs Gardens Residents Association

Belfairs Gardens Residents Association

Braintree District Council

BRE Global

Brentwood Borough Council

British Hardware Federation

British Horse Society

Burges Estate Residents Association (BERA)

Bus & Rail User Group

c2c Rail

Campaign to Protect Rural Essex (CPREssex)

Canewdon Parish Council

Chalkwell Ward Residents Association

Chart Plan (2004) Ltd

Chelmsford Borough Council

COBRA (Coalition of Borough Residents Associations)

Conservation Association Westcliff Seaboard

County Hotel

CPRE Southend Area

Crest Nicholson

Crime Prevention Panel (Leigh)

Crown Estate Office

Organisation

Cycling Touring Club (CTC)

Darby & Joan Organisation

DIAL Southend

English Sports Council (East)

Essex & Suffolk Water

Essex Amphibian & Reptile Group

Essex Badger Protection Group

Essex Biodiversity Project

Essex Bridleways Association

Essex Racial Equality Council

Essex Wildlife Trust

Essex Wildlife Trust - Southend and Rochford Group

Estuary Housing Association

Ethnic Minority Forum

Federation of Small Businesses

Fusion Online Ltd

GreenKeeper

Hamlet Court Road Business Association

Hamlet Court Road Business Association

Hanson Quarry Products

Harlow District Council

Hawkwell Parish Council

Heaton Planning

Herbert Grove Residents Association

Hindu Association (Southend & District)

Hobbs Parker

Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Horse Owners and Riders (SE Essex)

Hullbridge Parish Council

Iceni Projects

Iceni Projects Ltd

Iceni Projects Ltd

Indigo Planning

IPECO

Organisation

J.C Gibb Chartered Surveyors

Januarys

John Grooms Association

Kent County Council

Lambert Smith Hampton

Lancashire Digital Technology Centre

Landmark Town Planning Group

Leigh Cliff Association

Leigh Seafront Action Group

Leigh Society

Leigh Traders Association

Leigh-on-Sea Crime Prevention Panel

Lidl UK Ltd

Maldon District Council

Milton Community Partnership

Milton Conservation Society

Milton Conservation Society

Moat Homes

National Express East Anglia

National Federation for the Blind

National Rivers Authority Anglian Region

Network Rail (Town Planning Team)

Network Rail Property

NIBS

North Crescent & Feeches Rd Residents Association

Older Peoples Federation

Olympus KeyMed

OPA

Paglesham Parish Council

Parklife

Pebbles 1

Persimmon Homes (Essex) Ltd

Peter Harris Associates

Phase 2 Planning and Development

Organisation

Planning Perspectives LLP

Planning Perspectives LLP

Planning Perspectives LLP

Planning Potential

Planware Ltd

Port of London Authority

Powergen Plc

Prospects College

Qinetiq

Ramblers Association (Southend Unitary Authority)

Rayleigh Town Council

Residents Association of Westborough (RAW)

RIBA South East Chapter

Royal Association For Deaf People (RAD)

Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS)

Royal Mail Group Property

Royal National Lifeboat Institution - Southend Branch

SAEN

Sanctuary Group

Shoebury Residents Association

Shoebury Society

Shoebury Traders Association

Smart Planning Ltd

Smart Planning Ltd

Society for the Protection of Undercliff Gardens

SOS Domestic Abuse Projects

South East Essex Archaeological Society

South East Essex Archaeological and Historical Society

South East Essex College

South East Essex Friends of the Earth

South Essex Area Health Authority

South Essex Natural History Society

South Westcliff Community Group

Southend & District Aid Society

Organisation

Southend & District Pensioners Campaign

Southend & Leigh Fishermans Association

Southend & Surrounds Cycling Campaign

Southend Adult Community College

Southend and Westcliff Hebrew Congregation

Southend Animal Aid

Southend Area Bus Users Group

Southend Association of Voluntary Services

Southend Blind Welfare Organisation

Southend Hospital NHS Trust

Southend Islamic Trust

Southend Mencap

Southend Mind

Southend Ornithological Group

Southend Primary Care Trust (PCT)

Southend Properties (Guernsey) Ltd

Southend Sports Council & Southend Wheelers Cycling Club

Southend Taxi Drivers Association

Southend Tenants and Residents Federation

Southend Town Centre Business Group

Southend University Hospital

Southend Wheelers

Southend YMCA

Southend Youth Council

Southend-on-Sea Arts Council

Southend-on-Sea Guild of Help and Citizens Advice Bureau

Southend-on-Sea Sports Council

Sport England East

SSA Planning

St. Matthew's Christian Spiritualist Church (1999) Ltd.

Stambridge Parish Council

Stephensons of Essex

Stewart Ross Associates

Stock Woolstencroft Architecture and Urbanism

Organisation

Stockdale Group of Companies

Strutt and Parker

SUSTRANS Essex

Sutton Parish Council

Tarmac Southern Ltd

Tattersall Gardens Residents Group

Tendring District Council

Terence O'Rourke

Tesco Stores Ltd

Tetlow King Planning

Thames Gateway South Essex Partnership Ltd

Thames Water Property Services

The Guinness Trust

The Planning & Development Partnership

The Planning Bureau Ltd

The Salvation Army Leigh on Sea

The Southend Pier Museum Trust Ltd

The Southend Society

The Theatres Trust

The Victoria Shopping Centre

Tolhurst House Residents Association

Trust Links

University of Essex Southend

University of Essex Southend

Uttlesford District Council, Planning Department

Waitrose Ltd

West Leigh Residents Association

West Leigh Residents Association

Westborough Neighbourhood Action Panel

Westcliff & Leigh Neighbourhood Watch

Appendix 2: Copy of Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (December 2015) Consultation Material

To be inserted – Please refer to Table 1 above for Consultation Methods carried out during SCAAP Preferred Approach Consultation

Appendix 3: Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (2015) – Detailed Summary of Representations Received During the Consultation Period (18th December 2015 to 15th February 2016)

The below provides a summary of each representation made on the Preferred Approach version of the Southend Central Area Action Plan (SCAAP). Full submissions made during the consultation can be viewed on the Council's website.

SCAAP – Representations for SCAAP Preferred Approach

Policy, Para, Section, or Question	Respondent (Name) [No]	Rep No	Object/Support	Summary of Representation	Response to Representation
Part A: The Plan and its Context					
Sustainability Appraisal					
Question 1: Sustainability Appraisal	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2330	Comment	Sustainability information not available	The SA was made available for public comment as an integral part of the SCAAP consultation process.
Policies Map					
Question 2: Policies Map	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1935	Support	Support the Policies map as set out	Noted.
Question 2: Policies Map	The Cooperative Group (Mr A Thompson) [473]	1974	Object	The Co-operative Group would wish to see the inclusion of land at 53-57 Sutton Road Southend within the SCAAP as an additional Opportunity Site.	The Council is considering inclusion of this site as an opportunity site. This will be assessed against information supplied by the owners of the site to demonstrate that development is deliverable by 2021.

Question 2: Policies Map	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	1992	Comment	There is nothing in the document which justifies the Policies Map boundaries and they do seem somewhat arbitrary with the inclusion of vast swathes of residential areas which are unlikely to be the subject of significant change in the plan timescale. Large parts of areas of Victoria Gateway, Sutton Gateway and Kursaal estate are examples. On the other hand I would draw attention to the exclusion of St Marys Church from the Victoria area. The church and the adjoining properties on the corner of this important intersection are key elements in any junction improvement and should be included.	The SCAAP boundary has evolved through consultation and evidence, including the Central Area Masterplan, as well as previous versions of the SCAAP. St Marys Church is referenced in Policy DS2 – Key views, and Policy DS3 – Landmarks and Landmark Buildings, and therefore these policies will be taken into account in respect to any proposals that may impact upon it.
Question 2: Policies Map	Capitia Property Infrastructure On behalf of Genesis Housing [465]	2030	Comment	<p>The SCAAP preferred approach is supported. However, Capita P&I and Genesis consider that the OS11 site does not extend far enough, and that the adjacent Genesis site at Baxter Avenue should be incorporated within the OS11 site boundary. There are several reasons as to why, these are all explored in the supporting document. These considerations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall shortfall in housing supply and how the development of the site can help deliver the target; • The policy compliance of the proposal; • The removal of low quality housing; • Given the area of the site, a coherent regeneration masterplan approach should be adopted in accordance with OS11; • The site is well positioned on an access vista and therefore well located for a housing led regeneration initiative. <p>The site is available, achievable and deliverable. The redevelopment of the site would allow for the residential density of the site to be optimised, whilst also providing a quality mixed use development with active frontages.</p>	The Council is considering inclusion of this site as an opportunity site. This will be assessed against information supplied by the owners of the site to demonstrate that development is deliverable by 2021.
Vision					
Question 3: Vision	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1936	Support	Support the proposed vision as set out	Noted.

Question 3: Vision	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	1993	Comment	I have no problem with the Vision put forward for the centre, but I would question the rationale when it states that the regeneration of the centre will be led by the Uni campus. I have seen nothing in the document or elsewhere to suggest that the scale of activity, investment, etc. by the University would be such as to lead the way.	Noted, the rationale will not be included in the final version of the Plan. Growth of the university is regarded as one of the key elements which will lead to the successful regeneration of the town centre, as recognised by the Core Strategy DPD (Policy KP1).
Question 3: Vision	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2047	Support	Support the aspiration for Southend to be a City by the Sea and be a prosperous, vibrant, safe, thriving regional Centre as the cultural hub within the Thames Gateway and a great place to live, work and visit.	Noted.
Question 3: Vision	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2048	Comment	Would argue that in relation to the Strategic Vision the Sea is what gives Southend its Unique Selling Point (USP) and this needs to be a key theme in relation to future planning policy supporting the continued growth, regeneration and reinvestment.	Noted.
Question 3: Vision	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2149	Support	Support the aspiration for Southend to be a City by the Sea and be a prosperous, vibrant, safe, thriving regional Centre as the cultural hub within the Thames Gateway and a great place to live, work and visit.	Noted.

Question 3: Vision	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2150	Comment	Would argue that in relation to the Strategic Vision the Sea is what gives Southend its Unique Selling Point (USP) and these need to be a key theme in relation to future planning policy supporting the continued growth, regeneration and reinvestment.	Noted.
Question 3: Vision	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2238	Support	Southend BID received a 100% consultation responses having sent the Pro Forma out to 50 plus business consultees. The results of these can also be found in the tables in Appendix 4. Overwhelmingly the business consultees supported the SCAAP aspiration for Southend to be a prosperous, vibrant, safe cultural hub and City by the Sea. 94% of respondents supported that. In relation to the SCAAP's aspirational growth in homes in the Central Area 74% of the consultees supports the Councils vision. In relation to the job growth within the SCAAP area 90% of the respondents supported the Councils aspiration.	Noted
Question 3: Vision	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2331	Comment	The vision is too vague to make a judgement. This 2015 document only mentions people as categories. It mentions building on car parks and creating more precincts without any consideration of how people of all ages and abilities including elderly and/or disabled, (blind, deaf, restricted mobility, learning disabled) mums with children and buggies are going to access and move in this changed and regenerated town centre or how it will cater for all kinds of visitors. Where is the statement of Equality duty?	The vision is considered to be an appropriate statement of what the Borough Council wishes to achieve in the central area of the town. Details of movement and function are contained in the policy provisions of the Plan. An Equalities Impact Assessment will be carried out for the Proposed Submission version of the Plan.
Question 3: Vision	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2360	Object	We do not agree with the vision of Southend as a "City by the Sea". We resent the amount of public money being spent on Bids to become a City. There is no evidence that the residents desire this status or indeed that Her Majesty would be inclined to support it. The image of the town already attracts over 6 million visitors a year, and it will always be perceived as a 'down market seaside resort'. What needs changing is the economy. More well paid jobs in modern hi-tech industries. This we believe is planned	The vision sets out the Council's long term view and aspirations for the central area of the town. This is considered to be an ambitious and appropriate vision to work towards in the interests of improving the vitality and viability of the area. No changes proposed.

Question 3: Vision	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2398	Comment	We would suggest that the issue of heritage is translated into the vision (paragraph 25) through this addition: "As a prosperous and thriving regional centre with a rich heritage, it will be an area..."	Noted. It is accepted that the vision does not make reference to heritage which is vitally important to the central area. <i>It is therefore proposed that the words 'heritage and' be added after the words 'rich in'. The vision in paragraph 25 would then read 'Our vision for Southend Central Area, which includes the Town Centre and Central Seafront Area, is for it to be a City by the Sea. As a prosperous and thriving regional centre <u>and resort</u>, it will be an area that is vibrant, safe and hospitable, rich in <u>heritage</u>, commerce, learning and culture and an attractive, diverse place where people want to live, work and visit for both day trips, overnight and longer stays.'</i>
Strategic Objectives					
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1937	Support	Support the Strategic Objectives as set out in the document	Noted.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	1994	Comment	Similarly I have no problem with the Strategic objectives with the exception of one fundamental addition. All efforts to promote design excellence, quality developments and use of sustainable materials will be for nothing without continuing effective maintenance and upkeep. Where the Council has the opportunity and that is especially work in the public realm, routine and timely maintenance to retain the intrinsic value of the work is essential. The designs of today are our heritage of tomorrow.	Noted.

Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2054	Support	Support the improvements to the transformation on economic, vitality, viability and diversity of Southend Central Area and the encouragement of a wide range of homes, businesses and retail. It would also support the opportunity for additional learning, recreation and leisure.	Noted.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2055	Support	Support the Councils aspiration for design excellence and good quality development proposals and significant public realm improvements to reinforce the sense of place to compliment the new and existing infrastructure and townscape of the Central Area.	Noted.

Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2056	Support	Supports the Council's aspiration to establish Southend as low carbon City providing that it doesn't have any adverse impact in terms of access, connectivity and parking allocations within the Central Area.	Noted.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2057	Support	Support the improvement to accessibility and the further encouragement of sustainable modes of transport.	Noted.

Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2069	Support	Support the Council in their aspiration to (i) improve Competitive Performance (ii) Reduce the cost base (iii) Diversify away from retail uses (iv) grow the local economy and/or population, which is a strong theme in the preferred option principle. Recognise that the High Street should be a social place that makes creative use of public space with a vibrant evening economy.	Noted.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2156	Support	Support the improvements to the transformation on economic, vitality, viability and diversity of Southend Central Area and the encouragement of a wide range of homes, businesses and retail. It would also support the opportunity for additional learning, recreation and leisure.	Noted.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2157	Support	Support the Councils aspiration for design excellence and good quality development proposals and significant public realm improvements to reinforce the sense of place to compliment the new and existing infrastructure and townscape of the Central Area.	Noted.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2158	Support	Supports the Councils aspiration to establish Southend as low carbon City providing that it doesn't have any adverse impact in terms of access, connectivity and parking allocations within the Central Area.	Noted.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2159	Support	Support the improvement to accessibility and the further encouragement of sustainable modes of transport.	Noted.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2171	Support	Support the Council in their aspiration to (i) improve Competitive Performance (ii) Reduce the cost base (iii) Diversify away from retail uses (iv) grow the local economy and/or population, which is a strong theme in the preferred option principle. Recognises that the High Street should be a social place that makes creative use of public space with a vibrant evening economy	Noted.

Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2239	Support	<p>Southend BID received a 100% consultation responses having sent the Pro Forma out to 50 plus business consultees. The results of these can also be found in the tables in Appendix 4.</p> <p>Overwhelmingly the business consultees supported the SCAAP aspiration for Southend to be a prosperous, vibrant, safe cultural hub and City by the Sea. 94% of respondents supported that. In relation to the SCAAP's aspirational growth in homes in the Central Area 74% of the consultees supports the Councils vision. In relation to the job growth within the SCAAP area 90% of the respondents supported the Councils aspiration.</p>	Noted
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2471	Comment	<p>A number of strategic objectives are set out within the SCAAP which include improving and transforming the economic vitality, viability and diversity of Southend Central Area by encouraging the establishment of a wider range of homes, businesses and shops whilst providing new opportunities for learning, recreation and leisure. We suggest that a further strategic objective be included that seeks to maintain and protect existing shops and town centre uses in the Southend Central Area.</p>	Strategic Objective 1 seeks to improve and diversify the town centre to ensure its future economic vitality and viability. To protect existing shops and other uses per se is not considered appropriate if a flexible approach to the future development of the central area is to be achieved. No changes are proposed.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Bowhill Planning Partnership (Anthony Bowhill) [474]	2321	Support	<p>Objective 1 - Currently the High Street is run-down. This is partly due to the recession (2008-2014) but more fundamentally to the restricted hinterland of The Centre which only has two main sides. This means that the shopping draw is limited as testified by the growing number of vacancies.</p> <p>Thus a wider range of uses in the High Street providing diversity and assisting viability and vitality is to be welcomed. I, therefore support Objective 1 with its emphasis on "a wider range of..." which would help to increase the draw of the shopping centre.</p>	Noted.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Bowhill Planning Partnership (Anthony Bowhill) [474]	2322	Support	<p>Objective 8 is welcomed by bringing more people into the centre to live who will be able to supports its vitality.</p>	Noted.

Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2332	Comment	Too generalised for comment.	The strategic objectives set out the main direction for the Plan. The details are contained within its policy provisions.
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2397	Support	Welcome the identification of Southend's heritage in the context and issues (paragraph15) and its inclusion as Strategic Objective 7.	Noted
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [334]	2419	Comment	Strategic Planning Context We are pleased that Flood Risk Management and Sustainable Drainage is included within the Context and Issues for the Southend Central Area, and in particular, that reference is made to the key challenge of addressing climate change. This section discusses the risk of tidal flooding to the Borough, although it should be noticed that there are other sources of flood risk which will need to be considered too.	Noted, additional text will be included in Issues I of 'Context and Issues for the Southend Central Area' to outline that the SCAAP area is also susceptible to surface water flooding as follows: <i>'Southend has been identified by the Environment Agency as susceptible to local <u>surface water</u> flooding under conditions of extreme rainfall.'</i>
Question 4: Strategic Objectives	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2361	Support	Yes we agree	Noted.
Part B: Development Strategy					
Central Area Strategy					
Question 5: Central Area Strategy	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1938	Support	Agree with the proposed Central Area Strategy as set out	Noted.

Question 5: Central Area Strategy	Mr Michael Davies [493]	2036	Comment	An important question is- Will current and future generations thank us for the new plans in years to come? High-rise developments like these may be typical of a large city, but I'm not sure that many residents of Southend want to live in a 'City by the sea'. I think they'd want Southend to retain some of its 'seaside town' charm. London is only an hour's train ride away; let's keep it that way, and not let London engulf the area. A vibrant, but charming town is the best thing to aim for, in my view.	Noted. The Plan puts in place a number of policy provisions to protect the central areas heritage assets and the character and setting of the area. Furthermore, Policy DM4 of the Development Management Document sets out provision for managing tall and large buildings. No changes are proposed.
Question 5: Central Area Strategy	Mr Michael Davies [493]	2039	Comment	Have the Council considered a Park & Ride for Southend, to ease the long traffic queues along the A127 at busy times? It works well in Chelmsford and other towns.	Park and Ride schemes have been considered a number of times in recent years but have not been considered feasible given the limited land available and linear peninsula geography of the town. The provision of Park and Ride would only be feasible outside the SCAAP boundaries. Such options will be kept under review as part of the on-going Local Transport Plan provisions and development of the Southend Local Plan. No changes are proposed.
Question 5: Central Area Strategy	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2070	Support	Support the Council in their aspiration to (i) improve Competitive Performance (ii) Reduce the cost base (iii) Diversify away from retail uses (iv) grow the local economy and/or population, which is a strong theme in the preferred option principle. Recognise that the High Street should be a social place that makes creative use of public space with a vibrant evening economy.	Noted.
Question 5: Central Area Strategy	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2172	Support	Support the Council in their aspiration to (i) improve Competitive Performance (ii) Reduce the cost base (iii) Diversify away from retail uses (iv) grow the local economy and/or population, which is a strong theme in the preferred option principle. Recognises that the High Street should be a social place that makes creative use of public space with a vibrant evening economy	Noted.

Question 5: Central Area Strategy	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2240	Support	Southend BID received a 100% consultation responses having sent the Pro Forma out to 50 plus business consultees. The results of these can also be found in the tables in Appendix 4. Overwhelmingly the business consultees supported the SCAAP aspiration for Southend to be a prosperous, vibrant, safe cultural hub and City by the Sea. 94% of respondents supported that. In relation to the SCAAP's aspirational growth in homes in the Central Area 74% of the consultees supports the Councils vision. In relation to the job growth within the SCAAP area 90% of the respondents supported the Councils aspiration.	Noted
Question 5: Central Area Strategy	Bowhill Planning Partnership (Anthony Bowhill) [474]	2323	Support	The Strategy is supported and every effort should be made to bring forward various identified sites particularly for new residential	Noted.
Question 5: Central Area Strategy	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2333	Comment	Too broad to comment	The central area strategy is a broad statement of what the Plan is trying to achieve.
Question 5: Central Area Strategy	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2362	Support	Yes we agree	Noted.
Criteria Based Policies					
Maintaining a Prosperous Retail Centre – Policy DS1					
Question 6; Policy DS1	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1939	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to maintaining a prosperous retail centre	Noted.

Question 6; Policy DS1	Mr Jason Pilley [469]	1965	Comment	I would like to make the comment that attempting to move shops out of the High Street towards outlying areas of the town would be a bad idea on many levels. For one thing it would increase people's reliance on cars, which isn't just environmentally unsound but is also an example of poor land-use planning, we ought to be making it easier for people to get to shops, not harder; we ought to be building up a strong central community, not dissipating it.	Policy DS1 makes no provision for out of centre retail. Wider retail policy for the Borough is set out within the adopted Core Strategy within the framework of which the SCAAP has been prepared. Retail development outside the SCAAP area will be considered against the adopted Core Strategy and national planning policy. These contain a town centre first approach to retail and other town centre proposals. Significant out of town retail development proposals will have to satisfy a sequential test (i.e. looking at town centre sites first) and be subject to an impact assessment.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Mr Jason Pilley [469]	1966	Comment	The character and soul and reputation of towns and cities are determined by their centre, not by their outskirts. A High Street full of pawn shops and cheapo stores and closed-down restaurants won't be doing anyone any favours	See comments in relation to Rep 1965
Question 6; Policy DS1	Burges Estates Residents Association [176]	1995	Comment	Maintaining a prosperous retail centre begs the question as to how prosperity is measured. Does the retail turnover statistics for the centre show a level of prosperity that is considered adequate since the policy options seek only to maintain the current prosperity not improve or enhance it? Anecdotal evidence suggests otherwise with vast sums of disposable income from Southend residents increasingly spent at Bluewater, Lakeside, Westfield and even Chelmsford as Southend has slowly declined with many poor quality, here today gone tomorrow, shops.	Noted, it is proposed to remove the word 'maintaining' from the title of Policy DS1 and to amend this to read ' A Prosperous Retail Centre '.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2044	Comment	Based on various research and commissioned reports there is substantive evidence to indicate that the High Street is mainly singular, and due to change in customer expectations and behaviour the type of High Street is no longer viable.	Policy PA1 provides for a flexible approach to the future development of the High Street incorporating mixed use development and public realm improvements that contribute to the vitality and viability of the centre. Furthermore, Policy DS1 allows for a greater mix of town centres uses, such as cafes and restaurants. No changes are proposed.

Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2045	Comment	Support the Council's view that spatially the High Street and connections to the seafront are an inappropriate configuration for regeneration and commercial vitality.	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2046	Support	Support idea of the Central Seafront Area achieving a compact defined prime retail core in the Town Centre with a mixture of uses and peripheral areas made over to complimentary uses and in particular support the intensification of the growth of housing in the Central Area.	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2059	Support	Recognise the importance of the Town Centre in viability and vitality terms and the need to enhance the existing markets where appropriate and introduce and create new markets.	Noted.

Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2062	Comment	High Streets Adapting for Change (RICS) introduces the Governments recognition that our High Streets have to offer something new and different that neither the shopping centres nor the internet can match. They need to offer an experience that goes beyond retail and they need to be a destination for the socialising culture, health, well being, creativity and learning. Offices alongside shops, alongside housing, alongside eateries.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2065	Comment	Changes in consumer behaviour, the growth in car ownership and its impact on accessibility of in and out of Town Centre shopping are reasonably well understood. This is particularly likely to be an issue should the Council grant the Fossetts Farm application to subsequently increase a retail offer in an out of town centre location.	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2067	Comment	The growth of out of town shopping centre has been widely blamed for Town Centre decline and planning policies have attempted to restrict this growth, which the Stockvale Group wish to see reflected in the Council's determination of planning applications at Fossetts Farm. (The outcome of Planning Applications for extensive retail at Fossetts Farm will determine the value of the Council progressing the SCAAP process. If Fossetts Farm retail development is approved the Stockvale Group feel the SCAAPs aspirations will be undeliverable.	The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundary. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact was taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study). Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy provisions and require a further retail impact assessment. No changes are proposed.

Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2071	Support	Support the Council in their aspiration to (i) improve Competitive Performance (ii) Reduce the cost base (iii) Diversify away from retail uses (iv) grow the local economy and/or population, which is a strong theme in the preferred option principle. Recognise that the High Street should be a social place that makes creative use of public space with a vibrant evening economy.	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2073	Comment	Given that there is a shortage of housing and surplus retail property, there is no doubt that conversion to residential use should form part of the future of the Town Centre.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this. In relation to ground floor conversion, this would be outside of designated shopping frontage and in accordance with national policy.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2075	Comment	SCAAP should be seeking diversification of some of the retail uses on the ground floor as conversion to residential uses, providing attractive exit strategies for the asset managers and investors. This needs careful consideration in terms of how spatially to organise the retail uses	Policy DS1 seeks to protect retail and town centre uses on the ground floor in identified shopping areas in order to maintain the vitality and viability of the centre. No changes are proposed.

Question 6; Policy DS1	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2077	Comment	Many of our High Streets have been shaped by their past; however they are now trapped in their current configurations and often in poor shape to face the future. In relation to Southend on Sea, this is certainly the case. The High Street in particular has a linearity with no social space for congregation, interaction and the alternative commercial uses that would reactivate these spaces such as cafes, coffee shops, office space and importantly a high intensification of residential uses both at ground level and above The SCAAP and the Stockvale Group recognise that the High Street in particular requires a restructuring on a significant scale.	The SCAAP recognises the need to enhance and broaden the offer in the High Street and seeks to do this by providing a more flexible approach in the determination of planning applications to encourage a mix of retail, cafe and restaurant uses. The Plan also seeks to enhance and promote new public spaces within the centre. No changes are proposed.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2145	Comment	Based on various research and commissioned reports there is substantive evidence to indicate that the High Street is mainly a singular and due to change in customer expectations and behaviour the type of High Street is no longer viable.	Policy PA1 provides for an approach to the future development of the High Street that incorporates mixed use development and public realm improvements that contribute to the vitality and viability of the centre. No changes are proposed.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2146	Comment	Support the Council's view that spatially the High Street and connections to the seafront are an inappropriate configuration for regeneration and commercial vitality.	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2148	Support	Support idea of the Central Seafront Area achieving a compact defined prime retail core in the Town Centre with a mixture of uses and peripheral areas made over to complimentary uses and in particular support the intensification of the growth of housing in the Central Area.	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2161	Support	Recognise the importance of the Town Centre in viability and vitality terms and the need to enhance the existing markets where appropriate and introduce and create new markets	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2164	Comment	High Streets Adapting for Change (RICS) introduces the Governments recognition that our High Streets have to offer something new and different that neither the shopping centres nor the internet can match. They need to offer an experience that goes beyond retail and they need to be a destination for the socialising culture, health, well being, creativity and learning. Offices alongside shops, alongside housing, alongside eateries.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2167	Comment	Changes in consumer behaviour, the growth in car ownership and its impact on accessibility of in and out of Town Centre shopping are reasonably well understood. This is particularly likely to be an issue should the Council grant the Fossetts Farm application to subsequently increase a retail offer in an out of town centre location.	Noted.

Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2169	Comment	The growth of out of town shopping centre has been widely blamed for Town Centre decline and planning policies have attempted to restrict this growth, which the Stockvale Group wish to see reflected in the Council's determination of planning applications at Fossetts Farm. (The outcome of Planning Applications for extensive retail at Fossetts Farm will determine the value of the Council progressing the SCAAP process. If Fossetts Farm retail development is approved the Stockvale Group feel the SCAAPs aspirations will be undeliverable).	The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundaries. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact was taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study). Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy and require a further retail impact assessment. No changes are proposed.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2173	Support	Support the Council in their aspiration to (i) improve Competitive Performance (ii) Reduce the cost base (iii) Diversify away from retail uses (iv) grow the local economy and/or population, which is a strong theme in the preferred option principle. Recognises that the High Street should be a social place that makes creative use of public space with a vibrant evening economy	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2175	Comment	Given that there is a shortage of housing and surplus retail property, there is no doubt that conversion to residential use should form part of the future of the Town Centre.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this. In relation to ground floor conversion, this would be outside of designated shopping frontage and in accordance with national policy.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2177	Comment	SCAAP should be seeking diversification of some of the retail uses on the ground floor as conversion to residential uses, providing attractive exit strategies for the asset managers and investors. This needs careful consideration in terms of how spatially to organise the retail use.	Policy DS1 seeks to maintain retail uses or other town centre uses that provide an active frontage and contribute to the vitality of the town centre. No changes are proposed.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2179	Comment	Many of our High Streets have been shaped by their past, however they are now trapped in their current configurations and often in poor shape to face the future. In relation to Southend on Sea, this is certainly the case. The High Street in particular has a linearity with no social space for congregation, interaction and the alternative commercial uses that would reactivate these spaces such as cafes, coffee shops, office space and importantly a high intensification of residential uses both at ground level and above. The SCAAP and the Stockvale Group recognise that the High Street in particular requires a restructuring on a significant scale.	The SCAAP recognises the need to enhance and broaden the offer in the High Street and seeks to do this by encouraging a mix of retail, cafe and restaurant uses. The Plan also seeks to enhance and promote new public spaces within the centre. No changes are proposed.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2244	Comment	Retail provision achieved 82% top score high priority.	Noted.

Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2261	Comment	Whilst the BID do not object or have any particular concern regarding the moving of the Southend Football Club the move is predicted on the suggested development requirement to combine a significant number of retail outlets. This is being presented as a financial necessity to allow the Club to move to new premises, however, if this is supported many if not all the High Street chains are likely to follow.	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2263	Object	<p>In relation to the Fossetts Farm development. Proposals to have a large quantum of A1 retail provision would have a major impact on the Town Centre which is highly likely to lead to a further decline of an already struggling retail offer within the High Street and surrounding environs. Furthermore, the highway connection and infrastructure would not support the level of traffic journeys that the proposals at Roots Hall are likely to generate.</p> <p>The BID would ask that the Council ensure that in accordance with advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) a sequential test is undertaken and would like to be informed of the conclusions in relation to the impact on the vitality and viability of the Town Centre. The BID are rightly concerned that the Fossetts Farm proposals will have negative impact on the future of the High Street and the existing retail economy of the SCAAP area.</p>	<p>The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundaries. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact was taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study).</p> <p>Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm, which includes a significant amount of retail development, will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy, satisfy a sequential test and require a retail impact assessment. No changes are proposed.</p>
Question 6; Policy DS1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2300	Support	Valad (Europe) largely agree to the proposed approach to maintaining a prosperous retail centre, however , a number of amendments are suggested:	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2301	Object	Part 7 of Policy DS1 states that the Council will encourage the landowner/landlord of a unit with little prospect of being occupied in the primary or secondary frontage to display local art. This should be removed. If this situation arises, the Council should liaise with the landowner/landlord and ask if this could be provided. It is not appropriate to set this out in policy.	The policy wording is considered to be appropriate as it seeks to 'encourage' landlords. This would necessitate consultation with the landlord/landowner. The policy merely sets out the Council's intent in such matters. However, it is considered that this statement can be moved to the supporting text.

Question 6; Policy DS1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2302	Object	Policy DS1 seeks to ensure that new retail development is well integrated and closely linked with the Town Centre Primary Shopping Frontage and that proposals for retail development inside or outside the Primary Shopping Area will be determined in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CP2 (relating to Town Centre and Retail Development). The policy should be amended to state that any out of centre retail will be determined in accordance with the NPPF and Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy (in so far as it conforms with the NPPF). Policy CP2 was drafted before the publication of the NPPF and is out of date in some respects, referring to the needs test, for example.	It is accepted that the Core Strategy was adopted before the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It is therefore proposed that the following words are added to the end of Policy DS1 point 2 as follows: ‘and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)’.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2334	Support	Yes if improvements to shopping area are made. A bright and clean shopping area will attract custom but much of the shopping area is uneven and dirty.	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2363	Support	Yes – need reliable buses	Noted.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2385	Comment	The city centre lacks large retailers such as John Lewis etc and the shopping centres are outdated and house little of use to the population. Smaller retailers should be housed in the more traditional road side areas as opposed to shopping centres. A regular farmers market should be promoted further in the pedestrian centre and local Essex produce promoted. This should run over the weekend to allow workers to take advantage of this useful and enhancing function. Chelmsford has a new John Lewis and a thriving farmers market and the town centre is better for it.	The SCAAP in Policy DS1 seeks to provide for a prosperous retail centre and promotes the provision of street markets. No changes proposed.
Question 6; Policy DS1	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2386	Comment	Shop fronts should have strict planning permission on them and rid the town of dilapidated and tacky cheap plastic oversized advertising frontage. This will enhance the areas look (Bury St Edmunds), assist with job creation and the local economy.	Policy DS1 6. Seeks to ensure that shop fronts are of a high standard of design. The adopted Design Guide provides for appropriate shop front design. Policy DM5 sets out provision for frontages of townscape merit. No changes proposed.

Question 6; Policy DS1	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2399	Comment	Note that the current wording does not explicitly set out the importance of roof scape as a part of overall building frontages in paragraph 6.	Noted. It is proposed that the word 'roofscape' be inserted into Policy DS1 6. So that it reads: <i>'All new shop frontages will be of a high standard of design that is compatible with the architectural style, <u>roofscape</u> and character of the building and surrounding area....'</i>
Question 6; Policy DS1	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2427	Comment	All shops in the High street should have flat entrances and therefore be totally accessible for all customers including disabled people. Shops should not have A-boards or other obstacles outside them, restricting the safe passage of pedestrians especially Blind people. If restaurants and cafes want to have tables outside then they must have a metre high barrier, preventing blind people from walking in to them. When market stalls are positioned in the high street it is very difficult and dangerous for blind and partiality sighted people to walk.	Noted. Access arrangements to shops are considered as part of the design stage of planning applications to ensure accessibility for all users. No changes to policy are proposed. The Council seeks to discourage the use of 'A' Boards as outlined in the Streetscape Guide SPD.
Managing Primary Shopping Frontages - Policy Options DS1a, DS1b and DS1c					
Question 7: Managing Primary Shopping Frontages; Policy Options DS1a, DS1b and DS1c	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	1996	Comment	On balance Option B is to be preferred for providing the greatest flexibility in what is a fast changing situation. There is also the question mark about one or two centres. The plan makes implicit reference to reinforcing routes to the two main areas which suggests that the middle might become less of a Class A1 retail use. Overall while there is a case for upgrading and improving the shopping environment both in terms of public space and retail stores, the overall volume of retail space should not increase.	Noted.
Question 7: Managing Primary Shopping Frontages; Policy Options DS1a, DS1b and DS1c	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2303	Object	Three policy options are presented which seek to maintain a prosperous retail centre. In the first instance, further clarity is required as to how the length of frontage should be calculated when assessing the percentage of A1 units.	The Policy options refer to length of measured frontage which is depicted on the Policies Map. This is considered to be clear in its intent and has been successfully implemented as Council policy for over 20 years. No changes are proposed.

Question 7: Managing Primary Shopping Frontages; Policy Options DS1a, DS1b and DS1c	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2304	Support	<p>Valad (Europe) support Option C as it will allow for more restaurant (A3) uses which the town centre is currently lacking. More A3 uses will increase footfall and linked trips and support the night time economy thus adding to the vitality and viability of the town centre. Further flexibility should be built into this policy to allow other town centre appropriate uses to be permitted providing there is not an over concentration of these uses within a certain length of the frontage.</p> <p>It is widely acknowledged that the nature of retail is changing. It must be acknowledged that retail frontage policy needs to change, to allow capacity for other, new innovative uses, as well as other leisure and supporting uses which will create vitality in the borough's centres.</p>	Noted.
Question 7: Managing Primary Shopping Frontages; Policy Options DS1a, DS1b and DS1c	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2305	Comment	<p>The Council should also consider directing new large comparison retail developments onto existing car parks in order to help strengthen the town centre and prevent it from going into decline. This would achieve the town centre first approach to retail of the NPPF. Car parking could then be re-provided in the form of undercroft or multi storey parking facilities. This would assist in relieving pressure on existing parking facilities whilst bolstering the town centre, thus enhancing its vitality and viability.</p>	The policy provisions in the Plan promote mixed use developments on the existing car parks which would not preclude retail development if this were to come forward for consideration. No changes are proposed.
Question 7: Managing Primary Shopping Frontages; Policy Options DS1a, DS1b and DS1c; para 47, para 48	Bowhill Planning Partnership (Anthony Bowhill) [474]	2319	Comment	<p>It is clear (paras 47 & 48) that vacancy is higher than the average national town centre rate. While this may partly be as a result of the high level of vacancies in the Victoria Shopping Centre, inspection shows that there are also many vacant units in the High Street itself. In relation to this the increasing flexibility with regard to non-retail floor space set out in policy options DS1a-c provides a pragmatic approach to ensuring vacant units are used in an appropriate way, particularly for restaurant use.</p>	Noted.

Question 7: Managing Primary Shopping Frontages; Policy Options DS1a, DS1b and DS1c	Bowhill Planning Partnership (Anthony Bowhill) [474]	2320	Support	DS1a-c provides a pragmatic approach to ensuring vacant units are used in an appropriate way, with each option providing greater flexibility. Policy DS1c is to be supported as it provides the greatest flexibility, thus allowing more restaurants. The increase in the number of restaurants and cafes are to be welcomed as they will encourage shoppers to remain longer.	Noted.
Question 7: Managing Primary Shopping Frontages; Policy Options DS1a, DS1b and DS1c	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2335	Support	Option B supported .	Noted.
Question 7: Managing Primary Shopping Frontages; Policy Options DS1a, DS1b and DS1c	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2387	Comment	Quality restaurants should be promoted in the area and quiet bars should also be promoted instead of chain sports bars which degrade the area. Bars etc should not be concentrated in one area as this will again cause degradation and poor maintenance. This never works and if you look at union street in Plymouth and Botchergate in Carlisle a concentration of Lively bars ruins an area, promoting drugs, prostitution and dilapidated buildings.	Policy DS1 seeks to retain a balanced mix of uses within the town centre.
Employment					
Question 8	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1940	Support	Agree with proposed approach to employment development as it seeks to take advantage of the important opportunities that the central area has over the coming years.	Noted.

Question 8	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2040	Support	The aspirations and preferred options are supported in relation to the further regeneration, renewal and economic growth in the SCAAP area.	Noted.
Question 8	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2084	Support	Wholeheartedly support the encouragement and expansion of businesses in the Southend Central Area, although note that the issues around transport, access and parking need further consideration and understanding.	Noted.
Question 8	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2141	Support	The aspirations and preferred options are supported in relation to the further regeneration, renewal and economic growth in the SCAAP area.	Noted.
Question 8	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2187	Support	Wholeheartedly support the encouragement and expansion of businesses in the Southend Central Area, although note that the issues around transport, access and parking need further consideration and understanding.	Noted.

Question 8	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2241	Support	Southend BID received a 100% consultation responses having sent the Pro Forma out to 50 plus business consultees. The results of these can also be found in the tables in Appendix 4. Overwhelmingly the business consultees supported the SCAAP aspiration for Southend to be a prosperous, vibrant, safe cultural hub and City by the Sea. 94% of respondents supported that. In relation to the SCAAP's aspirational growth in homes in the Central Area 74% of the consultees supports the Councils vision. In relation to the job growth within the SCAAP area 90% of the respondents supported the Councils aspiration.	Noted
Question 8	National Federation for the Blind (Jill Allen King) [516]	2428	Comment	With reference to employment opportunities, consideration should be given to the employment of people with disabilities. The Council does have a responsibility under the Equality Act to take the needs of disable people in to account.	Noted
Housing					
Question 9: Residential Development (site allocations)	Basildon Borough Council (Amanda Parrott) [492]	2033	Support	It is recognised that additional work has been undertaken by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council to identify opportunity sites with the potential to deliver additional housing supply within the Southend Central Area, over and above that initially proposed in the Core Strategy. This is welcomed by Basildon Borough Council in terms of meeting housing needs arising within the South Essex Housing Market Area.	Noted.
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2074	Comment	Given that there is a shortage of housing and surplus retail property, there is no doubt that conversion to residential use should form part of the future of the Town Centre.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this. In relation to ground floor conversion, this would be outside of designated shopping frontage and in accordance with national policy.

Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2080	Support	As noted in the British Property Federation Report 'Meeting the Town Centre Challenge' Town Centres are accessible places suitable for densification and accommodating more housing. In this regards the Stockvale Group supports the aspirations of the Local Planning Authority through the SCAAP.	Noted.
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2087	Support	Support a higher intensification of residential uses in the Central Area together with a broader mix of commercial uses ranging from A1 retail, A3 restaurant café, D2 leisure and B1 offices to provide a more diverse multi-use High Street and Central Seafront.	Noted.

Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2094	Support	The STOCKVALE GROUP understand the concept of a much greater residential intensification of the SCAAP area and would wholeheartedly support the Councils aspirations for an additional 4000+ homes however, this must be in the context of insuring there is suitable amenity and infrastructure. The intensification together with a greater mix of uses in the Town Centre and Central Seafront create a much more buoyant and sustainable economy and the STOCKVALE GROUP welcome the Councils proposals as part of the SCAAP planning document.	Noted.
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2176	Comment	Given that there is a shortage of housing and surplus retail property, there is no doubt that conversion to residential use should form part of the future of the Town Centre.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this. In relation to ground floor conversion, this would be outside of designated shopping frontage and in accordance with national policy.
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2182	Support	As noted in the British Property Federation Report 'Meeting the Town Centre Challenge' Town Centres are accessible places suitable for densification and accommodating more housing. In this regards the BID supports the aspirations of the Local Planning Authority through the SCAAP.	Noted.
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2190	Support	Support a higher intensification of residential uses in the Central Area together with a broader mix of commercial uses ranging from A1 retail, A3 restaurant café, D2 leisure and B1 offices to provide a more diverse multi-use High Street and Central Seafront.	Noted.
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2197	Support	The BID understand the concept of a much greater residential intensification of the SCAAP area and would wholeheartedly support the Councils aspirations for an additional 4000+ homes however, this must be in the context of insuring there is suitable amenity and infrastructure. The intensification together with a greater mix of uses in the Town Centre and Central Seafront create a much more buoyant and sustainable economy and the BID welcome the Councils proposals as part of the SCAAP planning document.	Noted.

Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2242	Support	<p>Southend BID received a 100% consultation responses having sent the Pro Forma out to 50 plus business consultees. The results of these can also be found in the tables in Appendix 4.</p> <p>Overwhelmingly the business consultees supported the SCAAP aspiration for Southend to be a prosperous, vibrant, safe cultural hub and City by the Sea. 94% of respondents supported that. In relation to the SCAAP's aspirational growth in homes in the Central Area 74% of the consultees supports the Councils vision. In relation to the job growth within the SCAAP area 90% of the respondents supported the Councils aspiration.</p>	Noted
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Bowhill Planning Partnership (Anthony Bowhill) [474]	2324	Support	<p>It is crucial that more housing be provided in and close to the town centre. This is because Southend is ringed by the green belt and thus there is no room for outward expansion.</p> <p>Every effort should be made to find suitable new sites, including the use of redundant office blocks which are now no longer required. Owners and developers should be encouraged to bring these forward with the emphasis on the lower end of the market.</p>	Noted.
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2364	Comment	We must have more affordable family homes in the Borough of two storeys with gardens	Noted.
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barry Evans) [513]	2376	Comment	<p>Southend-On-Sea central residential area is dilapidated due to poor land lord management. Houses should be returned from multiple occupancy to private family homes. The property management companies and landlords in Southend are in it for pure profit, and many don't even live in Southend. This culture has been proven to bring down the standard of living in an area which is demonstrated all over Southend. The planning department should be promoting family owned homes in central Southend allowing private money to turn the dilapidated properties back in to quality family homes steering away from flats and multiple occupancy. This would attract London professionals who have the disposable income to significantly invest in their own properties, providing employment for local tradesmen.</p>	A key aspect of the SCAAP is to promote residential development in the central area to provide a range of dwelling types suited to housing needs. Policy DM7 of the Development Management Document also seeks to promote family accommodation. No changes proposed.

Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barry Evans) [513]	2381	Comment	Southend-On-Sea central area should make use of more student halls as opposed to multiple occupancy private landlord ran accommodation. The multiple occupancy student accommodation in residential areas has been studied elsewhere and is proven to bring down the area in which it is situated. Students living in residential areas do not do anything for that area. Students should be accommodated in halls which should be funded by the university. The current university halls are a complete eye sore and do nothing to enhance the local area. This architectural design is not sensitive to the culture in Southend and not built to last. Private landlords should be strictly controlled and forced to maintain properties to a high standard, which is currently not happening.	Noted. The Plan seeks to enhance and promote improved educational facilities and to provide opportunities for the provision of additional student accommodation, No changes proposed. Policy PA3.4. outlines that new student accommodation should be accompanied by a long term management and maintenance plan, to ensure the development has a positive impact on local amenity and environment for the lifetime of its use.
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2429	Comment	In section 65 you talk about new housing in the Central area. This should include housing for elderly and disabled people. I think you should also have sheltered housing and homes for elderly and disabled people. This would enable elderly and disabled people to walk to shops and take an active part in the life of their community.	The Plan seeks to provide for a range of housing types to meet housing needs.
Question 10: Residential Development (proposed approach)	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2430	Comment	<i>In paragraph</i> 75 all student accommodation should also be made fully accessible, so that not only disabled students can live there but they can be visited by their friends and family.	Noted. Access arrangements to residential accommodation are considered as part of the design stage of planning applications and will meet building regulations to ensure accessibility for all users.
Culture, Leisure, Tourism and Recreation					
Question 11	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1941	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to culture, leisure and recreation as it recognises its importance to the local economy	Noted.
Question 11	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	1999	Support	The drive towards enhanced culture, leisure and recreational activities is supported and indeed is essential if we are to take advantage of the huge potential for visitors from the continent. This must be coupled with more and better hotel accommodation to encourage longer stays.	Noted

Question 11	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2049	Object	Many of the Seafront businesses consulted as part of the Stockvale Group's own consultation have identified their concerns that leisure and tourism is not a strong focus of the SCAAP.	<p>The Central Seafront Policy Area aims and policy provisions (Policy CS1) seek to actively promote Southend as a 'thriving and vibrant leisure, cultural and tourism area' (page 110). However, it is recognised that this approach is not strongly reflected and identified in the vision, the strategic objectives or section 4.5 of the Plan (Culture, Leisure, Tourism and Recreational Facilities). It is therefore recommended that the words 'and resort' is added in the vision after 'regional centre'. The vision would then read: <i>'Our vision for Southend Central Area, which includes the Town Centre and Central Seafront Area, is for it to be a City by the Sea. As a prosperous and thriving regional centre <u>and resort</u>, it will be an area...'</i></p> <p>Strategic Objective 10 (page 18) would be amended and split to address these issues, and placed further up the ordering: <i>' To promote and enhance the tourism, cultural and leisure offer within the central area, including visitor accommodation, having regard to the assets offered by the area, in order to attract greater visitor numbers and promote more overnight stays. To promote the central area as a thriving learning quarter that provides state of the art facilities and well-designed student accommodation'.</i></p> <p>Amend the last sentence of paragraph 76 (page 39) to read: <i>'This will build on the town's role as a major resort and contribute to a stronger, more vibrant centre.</i></p>
-------------	---	------	--------	---	---

Question 11	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2151	Object	Many of the Seafront businesses consulted as part of the Stockvale Group's own consultation have identified their concerns that leisure and tourism is not a strong focus of the SCAAP.	<p>The Central Seafront Policy Area aims and policy provisions (Policy CS1) seek to actively promote Southend as a 'thriving and vibrant leisure, cultural and tourism area' (page 110). However, it is recognised that this approach is not strongly reflected and identified in the vision, the strategic objectives or section 4.5 of the Plan (Culture, Leisure, Tourism and Recreational Facilities). It is therefore recommended that the words 'and resort' is added in the vision after 'regional centre'. The vision would then read: <i>'Our vision for Southend Central Area, which includes the Town Centre and Central Seafront Area, is for it to be a City by the Sea. As a prosperous and thriving regional centre <u>and resort</u>, it will be an area...'</i></p> <p>Strategic Objective 10 (page 18) would be amended and split to address these issues, and placed further up the ordering: <i>'To promote and enhance the tourism, cultural and leisure offer within the central area, including visitor accommodation, having regard to the assets offered by the area, in order to attract greater visitor numbers and promote more overnight stays. To promote the central area as a thriving learning quarter that provides state of the art facilities and well-designed student accommodation'.</i></p> <p>Amend the last sentence of paragraph 76 (page 39) to read: <i>'This will build on the town's role as a major resort and contribute to a stronger, more vibrant centre.</i></p>
Question 11	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2243	Comment	Leisure and Tourism received 70% response as a top scoring 10 priority.	Noted.
Question 11	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2336	Comment	Much better promotion of the Pier and its Museum and better Quality building on the Pier is required. Tourist information is tucked away on the Pier and promotions at the railway stations and airport are needed as well as some direction in the town for information. The new Beecroft Art Gallery is bare inside and does not announce what it is outside with any colour	Noted.

Question 11	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2337	Comment	Public Art should not be a factor in planning permission.	Public art provision is considered essential to improving the public realm and environment.
Question 11	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2365	Support	Yes, but we need later running transport, and a concert hall.	Noted.
Question 11	Procurement Consulting (Mr Barry Evans) [513]	2389	Comment	Southend-On-Sea Council need a clearer tourist and seafront strategy. It is no good just stating that the pier is open to development and the seafront enhanced. Building high rise flats will not enhance the seafront and any developer that wishes to build should be prepared to enhance the infrastructure including car parks and access.	The vision and strategy is considered to be forward looking and ambitious. No changes proposed. Policy CS1 sets out the development principles that will be used to assess development proposals within the central seafront area. Policy DM4 of the Development Management Document sets out policy to manage tall and large buildings. Specific tourist and cultural strategies are prepared by other Council services outside of the SCAAP.
The Historic Environment					
Question 12	Milton Conservation Society (Mr Andy Atkinson) [488]	1977	Support	The broad intentions, including statutory obligations, are supported.	Noted.
Question 12	Milton Conservation Society (Mr Andy Atkinson) [488]	1978	Object	Far too little importance is given to our historic past, both designated and un-designated and instead it is seen as something of the past, to be preserved rather than part of our aggregated and improved future.	Noted. Detailed policy on the historic environment is contained within the Development Management Document (Policy DM5). It would be inappropriate and repetitive to include such policy provisions within the SCAAP. To emphasise the importance of the historic environment it is proposed to add a new sentence after 79 to read: <i>'Heritage assets will be promoted and enhanced as part of the future development of the town'</i> .

Question 12	Milton Conservatio n Society (Mr Andy Atkinson) [488]	1980	Comment	In particular we would like to see far more recognition given to historic Southend, including the non-designated building frontages 'of townscape merit' in the High Street. This 'townscape merit' should not just be a 'material consideration' in future planning decisions but should be woven into the future planning of our town centre. This is not because of some sort of nostalgic affection for these buildings (although this does strongly exist) but because these are amongst the best buildings in our town and future construction should aggregate from these with the best of human scaled, modern or traditional 'living' architecture.	Frontages of Townscape Merit are identified on the Policies Map and in Policy PA1. Detailed policy on the historic environment, including 'frontages of townscape merit', is set out in the Development Management Document (Policy DM5). No changes are proposed.
Question 12	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2081	Support	Supports the enhancement and quality of the Green and Open spaces along the Central Seafront and the protection of Southend's unique heritage including the nationally important Grade II Listed Southend Pier.	Noted.
Question 12	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2102	Support	The STOCKVALE GROUP note the townscape improvements and guidance on design quality and Heritage preservation and enhancement are inextricably linked to improvements to Public Realm and pedestrian connectivity. The STOCKVALE GROUP like the majority of the Town support the continued regeneration and reinvention of the Towns greatest icon Southend's Pleasure Pier. As there are a number of opportunity sites outlined in the SCAAP document, the STOCKVALE GROUP would suggest that the Council (through the SCAAP document) develop design codes and development briefs to ensure that the townscape improvements and quality of design of future developments meet the aspirational high standard to create a coherent and consistent Central Area. This needs to reflect on the Towns Heritage and look towards the future to create Southend as unique place and destination for leisure, shopping, living and working.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this and will be updated to identify a number of proposal sites that could be subject to a masterplanning approach.

Question 12	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2136	Support	There is wholeheartedly a support for regeneration and renewal of the SCAAP Area, the STOCKVALE GROUP would support the improvements to the Victoria Gateway through to the top end of London Road, down the High Street including Tylers Avenue, connection through to the Seafront from the High Street, improvements to the Seafront, the Public Realm, landscaping of the Public Realm, enhancement of key views and connectivity, preservation enhancement of the iconic Southend Pier and the general approach to intensification of the Town Centre	Noted.
Question 12	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney [496]	2183	Support	Supports the enhancement and quality of the Green and Open spaces along the Central Seafront and the protection of Southend's unique heritage including the nationally important Grade II Listed Southend Pier.	Noted.
Question 12	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney [496]	2205	Support	The BID townscape improvements and guidance on design quality and Heritage preservation and enhancement are inextricably linked to improvements to Public Realm and pedestrian connectivity. The BID like the majority of the Town support the continued regeneration and reinvention of the Towns greatest icon Southend's Pleasure Pier. As there are a number of opportunity sites outlined in the SCAAP document, the BID would suggest that the Council (through the SCAAP document) develop design codes and development briefs to ensure that the townscape improvements and quality of design of future developments meet the aspirational high standard to create a coherent and consistent Central Area. This need to reflect on the Towns Heritage and look towards the future to create Southend as unique place and destination for leisure, shopping, living and working.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this and will be updated to identify a number of proposal sites that could be subject to a masterplanning approach.
Question 12	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney [496]	2250	Comment	Townscape Improvements and Guidance on Design, Quality and Heritage Preservation were given a top 10 priority by 36% of respondents.	Noted.

Question 12	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney [496])	2265	Support	There is wholeheartedly a support for regeneration and renewal of the SCAAP Area, the BID would support the improvements to the Victoria Gateway through to the top end of London Road, down the High Street including Tylers Avenue, connection through to the Seafront from the High Street, improvements to the Seafront, the Public Realm, landscaping of the Public Realm, enhancement of key views and connectivity, preservation enhancement of the iconic Southend Pier and the general approach to intensification of the Town Centre	Noted.
Question 12: Management of the historic environment	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2338	Comment	The policy is well stated but the delivery of it is questioned.	Noted.
Question 12	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barry Evans) [513]	2382	Comment	Southend-On-Sea conservation areas should be extended and cover the majority of Southend's Georgian and Victorian buildings, both residential and commercial. Shop owners and retailers should have strict planning guidelines and be forced to maintain shop fronts. Shops such as Bargain buy with their over use of on street advertising and garish and tacky shop fronts should be banned and in place smaller and more traditional shop fronts should be used. Hitchin, Bury St Edmunds etc have good planning control which maintains the heritage look and feeling of pride in those towns.	Conservation Area reviews are undertaken periodically to assess whether there is merit in seeking to extend/promote new areas in the town. Shop front design is covered in the Council's adopted design guide. Policy DS1 also seeks to ensure shop frontages are of a high standard of design. Policy PA1.2.b. supports the conservation and restoration of historic shop fronts. No changes proposed.
Question 12	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2400	Comment	We note the rationale to not duplicate the policies contained elsewhere. We would suggest deleting "...and much of the archaeology in these locations is likely therefore to have been destroyed" from paragraph 91 as even previously developed sites have potential for archaeology and the focus should be on those sites of high potential.	This point is accepted. It is therefore proposed to delete the words ' <i>...and much of the archaeology in these locations is likely therefore to have been destroyed</i> ' from paragraph 91.
Question 12	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2401	Comment	We would recommend including Policy Linkages to Policies DM1, DM4 and DM6 in the Development Management DPD and Policy DS3 in the SCAAP itself.	Noted. It is proposed to include references in the policy linkages box to <i>Policies DM1, DM4 and DM6 in the Development Management DPD and Policy DS3 in the SCAAP itself.</i>

Open and Green Space Provision

Question 13	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1942	Support	Agree with proposed approach to open and green space provision in Southend Central Area	Noted.
Question 13	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2082	Support	Supports the enhancement and quality of the Green and Open spaces along the Central Seafront and the protection of Southend's unique heritage including the nationally important Grade II Listed Southend Pier.	Noted.
Question 13	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2137	Support	There is wholeheartedly a support for regeneration and renewal of the SCAAP Area, the STOCKVALE GROUP would support the improvements to the Victoria Gateway through to the top end of London Road, down the High Street including Tylers Avenue, connection through to the Seafront from the High Street, improvements to the Seafront, the Public Realm, landscaping of the Public Realm, enhancement of key views and connectivity, preservation enhancement of the iconic Southend Pier and the general approach to intensification of the Town Centre	Noted.
Question 13	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2184	Support	Supports the enhancement and quality of the Green and Open spaces along the Central Seafront and the protection of Southend's unique heritage including the nationally important Grade II Listed Southend Pier.	Noted.

Question 13	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney [496])	2266	Support	There is wholeheartedly a support for regeneration and renewal of the SCAAP Area, the BID would support the improvements to the Victoria Gateway through to the top end of London Road, down the High Street including Tylers Avenue, connection through to the Seafront from the High Street, improvements to the Seafront, the Public Realm, landscaping of the Public Realm, enhancement of key views and connectivity, preservation enhancement of the iconic Southend Pier and the general approach to intensification of the Town Centre	Noted
Question 13	Mr Alan Grubb [59]	2296	Comment	There is also a need to create green spaces in each of the new developments with semi matured trees, this will then invite the wild life (birds and squirrels)	Such provisions for urban greening are included in the various policies of the Plan. No changes are proposed.
Question 13	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2339	Comment	There is a plan to build on Blenheim Park an overlarge sports building. It is difficult to understand why the policies for the above culture and green spaces have been 'rationalised and removed. Does this mean that their importance has been allowed to downgrade?	Outside the Plan area.
Question 13	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2431	Comment	There are many guide dog owners who live in the Southend district and close to the high street as well as many that visit the high street for shopping and holidays. Currently there is no safe free running areas for our dogs and nowhere is there an area where our dogs can go to the toilet. Up to the time when the Odeon cinema was built in Victoria Circus area, there was always some grass where our dogs could go. Although our dogs are trained to go in a gutter there are very few of these now except in a few side streets. So please plan for designated areas close to bus and train stations and to shops. You cannot complain about dog mess when no areas are provided. When building blocks of flats and other housing this should also be provided, not only for guide dog owners but for other dog owners. Green areas should be provided with seating and shelters. The shelters to protect people from the rain and hot sun. There is no mention of Public Toilets in the document and they should be available throughout the town in shopping areas and green space areas.	The Plan seeks to enhance and provide new areas of open and green throughout the Central Area. No changes are proposed.

Question 14; Policy DS2	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1943	Support	Important to protect and enhance the management of Key Views in Southend Central Area.	Noted.
Question 14; Policy DS2	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	2000	Comment	The management of key views is acceptable but I have tried and failed to see Porters other than from inside the grounds. It is so well screened by trees and shrubs I doubt many people know it's there. In that sense it can hardly rank as a landmark building.	Policy DS3 not only sets out criteria protecting the views to and from landmark buildings, but the policy also seeks to conserve landmarks and enhance their setting. It is considered that the setting of Porters and links to the Queensway Policy Area can be improved. Furthermore, maintaining and enhancing key views to Porters is considered important and beneficial to the aesthetic quality of the local area. No change required.
Question 14; Policy DS2	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2043	Support	Wholly support enhancement and retention of key views	Noted.

Question 14; Policy DS2	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2138	Support	There is wholeheartedly a support for regeneration and renewal of the SCAAP Area, the STOCKVALE GROUP would support the improvements to the Victoria Gateway through to the top end of London Road, down the High Street including Tylers Avenue, connection through to the Seafront from the High Street, improvements to the Seafront, the Public Realm, landscaping of the Public Realm, enhancement of key views and connectivity, preservation enhancement of the iconic Southend Pier and the general approach to intensification of the Town Centre	Noted.
Question 14	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2144	Support	Wholly support enhancement and retention of key views	Noted.
Question 14; Policy DS2	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2248	Comment	Key Views were given a 20% top 10 priority.	Noted.

Question 14; Policy DS2	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2267	Support	There is wholeheartedly a support for regeneration and renewal of the SCAAP Area, the BID would support the improvements to the Victoria Gateway through to the top end of London Road, down the High Street including Tylers Avenue, connection through to the Seafront from the High Street, improvements to the Seafront, the Public Realm, landscaping of the Public Realm, enhancement of key views and connectivity, preservation enhancement of the iconic Southend Pier and the general approach to intensification of the Town Centre	Noted
Question 14; Policy DS2	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2402	Support	Welcome the identification of a number of key views, from within and of the central area, with the aim that they will not be adversely impacted by development.	Noted.
Landmarks and Landmark Buildings – Policy DS3					
Question 15; Policy DS3	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1944	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to landmarks/landmark buildings in Southend Central Area	Noted.

Question 15; Policy DS3	Milton Conservatio n Society (Mr Andy Atkinson) [488]	1979	Object	The document seems to place landmarks and landmark buildings (section 4.9) above the best quality aggregated urban design. This attitude of <i>landmark</i> (or 'iconic' building to use the popular language) is becoming discredited so it seems rather odd that it so strongly features in our forward looking planning. As an example, the Sainsbury site was, not many years ago, hailed by the planners of our town as an important and focal town centre development. Not many years passed before the folly of this development was then realised so that the site has been proposed for re-development, should Sainsbury's relocate, and this is included in the document. Your document feels like it will lead to similar, repeated mistakes in future. The student housing building, now proposed as nothing less than a new potential landmark building demonstrates exactly what we are claiming. This building is largely disliked and ridiculed because it was built as an iconic or landmark building that paid virtually no relation to its urban surroundings. This type of arrogant 'look at me' building should not be the focus of future urban development in the town centre.	Landmarks and landmark buildings provide orientation and aid way-finding, being recognisable and distinctive, and it is important that they are conserved. Policy DS3 sets out the provision for the development of new landmark buildings to ensure they are well designed and detailed to help reinforce local character and distinctiveness. The Sainsbury's site will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that it will be redeveloped by 2021.
Question 15; Policy DS3	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2247	Comment	Landmarks and Landmark Buildings 36% of respondents gave that top 10 priority.	Noted.
Question 15; Policy DS3	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2340	Support	Yes to the list of Landmark Buildings.	Noted.
Question 15; Policy DS3	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2341	Object	No to Potential Locations as already publicised at Opportunity Site 8: Seaway Car Park, Marine Parade and Opportunity Site 9 : New Southend Museum.	Seaway car park, Marine Parade and the New Southend Museum are key development sites identified in the SCAAP and are considered appropriate for the provision of new landmark buildings. Design and detailing will be important in such provision as set out in Policy DS3. No changes proposed.

Question 15; Policy DS3	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2403	Comment	Recommend that a bullet point d) is added to paragraph two of Policy DS3 stating: "d. the proposals do not harm the setting of nearby heritage assets."	These points are accepted. It is therefore proposed to include an additional criteria in paragraph 2 of Policy DS3 stating: ' <i>d. the proposals do not harm the setting of nearby heritage assets.</i> '
Question 15; Policy DS3	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2432	Comment	In paragraph 99 which refers to Landmark buildings, these buildings can help blind and partially sighted people to locate where they are, so long as they are well lit and have good colour contrast with their surroundings. Also tactile information should be given and provided. For example, a water fountain or chiming clock can help to find a building.	Noted.
Flood Risk Management and Sustainable Drainage					
Question 16; Policy DS4	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1945	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to flood risk management and sustainable drainage in Southend Central Area	Noted.
Question 16; Policy DS4	Anglian Water (Sue Ball) [37]	2028	Comment	For Surface water disposal we would expect a SuDS solution to be utilised where at all viable and under no circumstances will surface water be permitted to discharge into the foul sewerage system. (Infrastructure Provision 4.12 paragraph 140)	Noted. It is proposed to add the following text to Policy DS4 point 2 as follows: '...Under no circumstances will surface water be permitted to discharge into a separate foul sewer or sewerage system. Surface runoff that cannot be discharged into the ground, a surface water body or a surface water sewer or local highway drain, must be discharged to a public, combined sewer system.'
Question 16; Policy DS4	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2246	Comment	Flood Risk Management and Sustainable Drainage 48% of respondents gave that a top 10 priority.	Noted.
Question 16; Policy DS4	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2342	Comment	The Council persisted in its shared space along the sea front where flooding has damaged commercial properties and even put at risk the business of the owners.	Policy DS4 seeks effective flood risk management and sustainable drainage within new development. The maintenance and improvement of existing flood defence and mitigation is administered through complimentary Council services. It is proposed to include reference in Central Seafront policies to flood mitigation measures.

Question 16; Policy DS4	Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [334]	2420	Support	<i>Paragraph 105</i> - We are pleased to note reference is made here to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and emerging Surface Water Management Plan, which clearly form a key part of your evidence base.	Noted.
Question 16; Policy DS4	Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [334]	2421	Comment	<i>Paragraph 116</i> - With regards to surface water management, we wish to remind you that, whether or not the receiving water body is a main river, the Environment Agency is no longer the statutory consultee in the planning process. All surface water management scheme proposals and their associated discharge rates must therefore be approved by Southend Borough Council in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority.	Noted. Amend paragraph 116 last sentence to read, ' For main rivers and ordinary water courses, this will be the Council, and for public surface water sewers Anglian Water, '

Question 16; Policy DS4	Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [334]	2422	Comment	<p>We consider that further clarity could be provided within this policy.</p> <p>Our suggested changes are <i>as follows</i></p> <p>1 a. Will be accompanied by a flood risk assessment that considers all sources of flooding.</p> <p>1 c. i. For more vulnerable uses, the floor levels of habitable rooms will be above the design flood level, <i>with an allowance for climate change</i>. Within Flood Zone 3 the floor level must be situated above the design flood level <i>with climate change</i>, incorporating an allowance of at least 300mm for freeboard.</p> <p>(This is to ensure it is clear that floors must be set above the 1 in 200 annual probability event level plus climate change).</p>	<p>Noted, the following amendments are therefore proposed to DS4: <i><u>'1a. Will be accompanied by a flood risk assessment that considers all sources of flooding'. And</u></i></p> <p><i><u>'1ci. For more vulnerable uses, the floor levels of habitable rooms will be above the design flood level, with an allowance for climate change*'. Within Flood Zone 3 the floor level must be situated above the design flood level with allowance for to climate change*, incorporating an allowance of at least 300mm for freeboard.</u></i></p> <p><i>* This is to ensure that floors must be set above the 1 in 200 annual probability event level plus climate change</i></p>
Transport, Access and Public Realm					
Question 17; Policy DS5	Rev. Phyllis Owen [456]	1929	Object	Insufficient allowance for parking to take into account the number of residential units proposed.	The Councils parking standards are set out in the Development Management Document and these have been found sound by a planning inspector and subsequently adopted.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1946	Comment	Agree with the proposed approach to the management of transport, access and the public realm in the Southend Central Area, with the proviso that it should be amended to state that the Council 'will maintain car parking capacity at a level that supports the vitality and viability of the town centre' rather than 'seeking to maintain car parking capacity....'	Agree; the amendment is appropriate in the context of Policy DS5.2.a. Remove the word 'seek'. The Council has commissioned an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Mr David Batley [479]	1975	Support	I strongly support the introduction of bus priority measures along the A13 (London Road). Most of Westcliff and Leigh near this road consist of high-density housing with no off-street parking, a land-use pattern which works well with high-frequency public transport.	Noted.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Mr Harry Chandler [219]	1988	Comment	It might be worth considering the creation of a tramway based on the bus station to connect Southend airport, Victoria Avenue, Southend Victoria railway station, Southend Central, the High Street and the sea front. It is likely that the creation of a tramway would encourage more visitors to come to Southend by train and help reduce our car parking problems.	Policy PA8 identifies the need for a priority route to be provided linking Southend Central Area with London Southend Airport. This does not preclude innovative transport schemes to link these points. Such improvements will be pursued mainly through the provisions of the Southend Local Transport Plan. A tramway is not considered viable or deliverable by 2021, and therefore is not included within the SCAAP. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	1990	Comment	There is an anti- car feeling about some of the comments. A reluctance to acknowledge its importance in sustaining the central area's economy and over emphasis on suppressing it in favour of other modes. Car parking is only mentioned in terms of capacity ignoring the issue of pricing which is one of the major disincentives that the centre faces.	The SCAAP seeks improvements to the transport network for all users. There have already been a number of major junction improvements. Further reference will be included in Policy DS5 to highlight proposed strategic junction improvements as outlined on the Policies Map. There will also be a review of signage and implementation of an integrated signage strategy to assist road users around the transport network and direct them to the most convenient car parks. The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	2001	Comment	Car parking on the sea front is mostly kerbside and it is difficult to believe that on- street parking duration is only 5mins. However the capacity needed to support the vitality of the town centre is not just a function of demand as it stands but the price mechanism. It must be a significant factor where choosing where to shop especially when so much of the competition has free parking.	The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP. It is proposed that specific reference to the 5 minute on-street parking duration will be removed.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	2002	Comment	The only other point on transport is mixed mode priority routes. Mixed in the sense of ped/cycle routes are not working because too many cyclists now have it in their heads that any footway or footpath is fair game. I know this is an enforcement issue but if it cannot or will not be enforced effectively then it is bad policy.	The implementation of new pedestrian and cycle routes will have regard to national guidance and best practice.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Mr Michael Davies [493]	2037	Comment	Serious thought needs to be given to what <i>to</i> do to the local traffic situation. If the plan includes a large number of residential flats, how many cars will that mean? Which way will they go to get out of town? Along the 'Golden Mile' and seafront towards Westcliff, then up Chalkwell Avenue to the London Road, or up Southchurch Avenue to try to join the A127 arterial road via Bournemouth Park Road, Sutton Road, or Victoria Avenue? Either way, it will mean added congestion, frustration, and stress for road users in an already very congested town.	Noted. Policy DS5 and related Policy Area policies make provision for a number of transport improvements, particularly junction improvements and the promotion of passenger transport. These will be actioned through the Local Transport Plan and partnership working. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2041	Comment	Transport and Access into the Town is a key theme and in order to deliver the aspired number of new dwellings and new jobs in the Central Area the Stockvale Group wish to see this appropriately addressed through the SCAAP documentation. At present Stockvale Group does not believe that the Transport, Access and Parking Issues have been given enough consideration. Nor the highway infrastructure on existing businesses let alone the aspirational growth.	<p>Policy DS5 together with the Policy Area policies provide for a number of transport and highway improvements within Southend Central Area to improve accessibility and provide for more sustainable methods of transport. The Local Transport Plan will develop these further in line with planned growth.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>

Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2042	Support	Wholly support townscape improvements, improvements to the public realm, vastly improved connectivity from car parks to the Seafront, car parks to the high street and the creation of active public spaces in an otherwise linear High Street.	Noted.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2050	Comment	As part of this representation we have reviewed Blackpool's Local Plan Making as a similar seaside town and comparable seaside resort. As part of the Blackpool Core Strategy Consultation and examination in public, the seafront businesses made succinct clear representation regarding the impact of traffic and parking on the sustainability and future growth of Blackpool as a tourist resort and destination of choice. The [Blackpool] Seafront business representation noted that the major attractions that make Blackpool a tourist destination rely on easy access to car parking and good access from car parks to the attractions by foot and public transport. The Seafront businesses further noted that this matter is often not well understood by councils, who generally consider that it is not necessary to plan car parking for peak periods only. In most industries, for example planning the levels of parking for shopping areas based only on the Christmas peak, this a reasonable approach but for the businesses which are seasonal and need to meet visitor targets to survive (or at least to continue at the present scale), this approach can have far reaching consequences.	Noted.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2051	Object	The Southend Seafront businesses feel this particular issue [related to peak periods for car parking] is not understood by the Local Authority and as such the level of tourism and investment has peaked. Many of the Seafront businesses have expressed their view as part of this consultation that they cannot invest further in the town due to the issue of access and parking and as such they already have a declining customer base.	<p>Policy DS5 and related Policy Areas include a number of proposals for improving transport accessibility. These policies will sit alongside the Local Transport Plan which aims to address issues of congestion, circulation and accessibility to Southend to assist economic growth.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2052	Comment	Members of the Stockvale Group together with representatives of local businesses within the SCAAP area discussed highways and parking issues with Southend on Sea Borough Council's Head of Planning and Transport. As the Chief Officer responsible for transport he was recorded as saying 'the issue with parking is if you create more parking spaces, more people will come and they will create congestion i.e. there will be greater numbers of visitors to the Town meaning greater business! This exasperates the concerns of local businesses that parking and transport issues are not fully understood and have no serious consideration as part of the Council's preferred option and SCAAP Framework.	Noted, no agreed minutes are recorded of this meeting. The purpose of the SCAAP is to plan for regeneration, growth and inward investment whilst taking account of impacts on matters such as amenity and the local environment. This is planned for within a range of travel mode options and the infrastructure necessary to support them.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2053	Comment	Interestingly the representations made by the Seafront businesses in Blackpool persuaded the Government Inspector of their position. The Inspector concluded in their report that 'Car Parks need to accommodate peak weekend/bank holiday parking'.	Noted. The Council is unable to identify this direct quote in the Inspector's Report that has been cited.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2076	Object	RICS paper 'High Streets Adapting for Change' discusses parking changes and out of town retail which provides free parking. Since 2007 many local authorities have increased parking charges significantly. In the SCAAP area this is a key issue which requires essential review. This is in contrast to the smaller districts of wider Southend on Sea, Leigh and Southchurch where the Council have extended free parking to 2 hours. Compared to Central Southend and the SCAAP area where parking for 2 hours is in excess of £3.30. In Stockvale Group's view this is a deterrent for people coming into Southend particularly for shopping. This combined with the poor spatial and environmental quality is a contributing factor to the decline of Southend's Town Centre.	The SCAAP recognises the importance of car parking provision to the vitality and viability of the centre. The wider implications of car parking charges are a matter which will be kept under review by the Borough Council as part of its overall approach to car parking for the Borough. The SCAAP is a planning policy document and does not directly cover parking charges. No changes are proposed.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2085	Support	Wholeheartedly support the encouragement and expansion of businesses in the Southend Central Area, although note that the issues around transport, access and parking need further consideration and understanding.	Noted.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2086	Object	Transport, access and parking issues need further consideration and are a particular issue for the Seafront businesses and the tourist economy. The highway infrastructure makes journeys into the town prolonged and difficult. Many visitors and customers simply don't return.	<p>Policy DS5 and related Policy Areas include a number of proposals for improving transport accessibility.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>

Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2090	Comment	Southend's Unique Selling Point is the Seafront which is a destination of choice. The Seafront and High Street inter relate on each other for business with the major attractions of Southend relying on easy access to car parking and good access from the car parks to the High Street and the Seafront attractions by foot or public transport.	Noted. The SCAAP seeks to improve and enhance connectivity between the seafront and town centre. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2091	Comment	Access into the Town is problematic certainly on peak days, but also in evenings when there are events on in the Town and Central Seafront. There is a view that from the Victoria Gateway junction to the Raleigh Weir on days of high visitation and sunny days the key route is completely grid locked between these two key points. This represents somewhere in the region of 3840 cars parked nose to tail across the main artery into the Town which is mainly a dual carriageway.	Accessibility improvements are on-going as part of the Local Transport Plan and other regeneration initiatives. No changes are proposed.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2092	Comment	<p>Some members of the STOCKVALE GROUP and representatives of the Seafront businesses believe that one way in which the congestion into the Town could be improved is for an additional 3840 parking spaces to be made accessible and available within close proximity to the Seafront and core High Street Area. This is due to the day visitor attraction industry, particularly family attractions such as the Seafront receiving the vast majority of its income in a few weeks of the year. These generally coincide with the school holidays. During this peak period a visitor attraction business needs to be able to accommodate every visitor that wants to visit as these peak days effectively subsidise the operation for the rest of the year.</p> <p>If the access to the main attractions is limited on peak days by the availability of car parking spaces, this could and does have serious impact on the viability of the Seafront businesses. The main parking areas are generally at capacity on peak holiday periods. Any loss of capacity as a result of the SCAAP proposals would result in a cap of visitors during these peak periods. This limits the amount of investment within the Seafront to the current status quo.</p> <p>Transport and access is not just limited to the Seafront and does have a huge impact on the High Street, combined with parking tariffs, access and egress, and poor legibility around the Town Centre. Whilst the changes outlined in the SCAAP from a space and use perspective will do an awful lot to reinvigorate and regenerate the High Street, this must be inclusive of a renewed and fresh approach to parking provision within the SCAAP Area.</p>	<p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
----------------------------	--	------	---------	--	---

Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2096	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there have been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The STOCKVALE GROUP would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2104	Comment	<p>Before the SCAAP document is enshrined, the STOCKVALE GROUP would ask that the Council carry out thorough research, analysis and investigation into the capabilities of the existing infrastructure and the capabilities of utility suppliers to meet the aspirational growth. This is essential and will need some degree of consideration in terms of new sub stations around the SCAAP area. This directly links to townscape and Public Realm improvements as these sub stations represent an opportunity to not create a negative space in the overall townscape. Many of the Members of the STOCKVALE GROUP are continuously seeking to improve their offer and find that the limitation of the existing utilities coming into the SCAAP area prohibit their future plans and proposals. This has not been at all addressed in the SCAAP document.</p>	<p>Infrastructure provision is addressed in the Plan. Such provisions have been subject to consultation with utility companies as part of the Plan preparation process. No changes are proposed.</p> <p>Further consultation with the National Grid will reveal whether further capacity is required to support the additional development in the Central Area. There was no objection from the National Grid to the housing and job targets in the Core Strategy.</p>

Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2110	Comment	There is the further opportunity to reopen the deepening alleviating some of the traffic stress that has resulted of the Highway alterations.	Noted. The Deeping was closed a number of years ago as part of transport improvements to the area. Its future use will be kept under review as part of on-going transport monitoring.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2126	Comment	There are a couple of issues that the STOCKVALE GROUP want to ensure are adequately addressed through the SCAAP. The first of those is the potential of having residents parking zones, this could have a negative effect on the existing Town Centre on and off street parking and consume spaces that are vital for visitors.	Noted. Such aspects will be kept under review as part of the on-going transport monitoring of the area.

Question 17	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2139	Object	Major concerns relating to all supported aspirations being achieved falls into a number of categories - transport, access and parking is a key theme and at present the existing parking provision is woefully inadequate. The access route into the Town is often unable to cater for the number of visitors on sunny days and this is likely to be detrimental to economic sustainability and the projected growth of 6,000 jobs within the SCAAP Area.	<p>Policy DS5 and related Policy Areas make a number of proposals for the improvement of transport and accessibility in the central area. These policies will sit alongside the Local Transport Plan which aims to address issues of congestion, circulation and accessibility to Southend to assist economic growth. No changes are proposed.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
Question 17	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2140	Object	The identified opportunity development sites are mainly existing public car parks. Through the SCAAP the Local Authority should seek a minimum of a replacement like for like number of public spaces on each of the sites whilst also meeting the development requirements in accordance with the Council's Development Management Policy.	<p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p> <p>The Development Management Document establishes maximum parking standards for commercial development and appropriate standards for residential development in the Central Area. The amount of parking provided for a development scheme will be assessed against these policy standards, together with a consideration of the sites local context, location and distance from public transport links.</p>

Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2142	Comment	<p>Transport and Access into the Town is a key theme and in order to deliver the aspired number of new dwellings and new jobs in the Central Area the Stockvale Group wish to see this appropriately addressed through the SCAAP documentation. At present Stockvale Group does not believe that the Transport, Access and Parking Issues have been given enough consideration. Nor the highway infrastructure on existing businesses let alone the aspirational growth.</p>	<p>Policy DS5 together with the Policy Area policies provide for a number of transport and highway improvements within the Central Area to improve accessibility and provide for more sustainable methods of transport. These policies will sit alongside the Local Transport Plan which aims to address issues of congestion, circulation and accessibility to Southend to assist economic growth.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2143	Support	<p>Wholly support townscape improvements, improvements to the public realm, vastly improved connectivity from car parks to the Seafront, car parks to the high street and the creation of active public spaces in an otherwise linear High Street.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2152	Comment	<p>As part of this representation we have reviewed Blackpool's Local Plan Making as a similar seaside town and comparable seaside resort. As part of the Blackpool Core Strategy Consultation and examination in public, the seafront businesses made succinct clear representation regarding the impact of traffic and parking on the sustainability and future growth of Blackpool as a tourist resort and destination of choice.</p> <p>The [Blackpool] Seafront business representation noted that the major attractions that make Blackpool a tourist destination rely on easy access to car parking and good access from car parks to the attractions by foot and public transport.</p> <p>The Seafront businesses further noted that this matter is often not well understood by councils, who generally consider that it is not necessary to plan car parking for peak periods only. In most industries, for example planning the levels of parking for shopping areas based only on the Christmas peak, this a reasonable approach but for the businesses which are seasonal and need to meet visitor targets to survive (or at least to continue at the present scale), this approach can have far reaching consequences.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2153	Object	The Southend Seafront businesses feel this particular issue [related to peak periods for car parking] is not understood by the Local Authority and as such the level of tourism and investment has peaked. Many of the Seafront businesses have expressed their view as part of this consultation that they cannot invest further in the town due to the issue of access and parking and as such they already have a declining customer base.	Policy DS5 and related Policy Areas include a number of proposals for improving transport accessibility. These policies will sit alongside the Local Transport Plan which aims to address issues of congestion, circulation and accessibility to Southend to assist economic growth. The Council has commissioned an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2154	Comment	Members of the Stockvale Group together with representatives of local businesses within the SCAAP area discussed highways and parking issues with Southend on Sea Borough Council's Head of Planning and Transport. As the Chief Officer responsible for transport he was recorded as saying 'the issue with parking is if you create more parking spaces, more people will come and they will create congestion i.e. there will be greater numbers of visitors to the Town meaning greater business! This exasperates the concerns of local businesses that parking and transport issues are not fully understood and have no serious consideration as part of the Council's preferred option and SCAAP Framework.	Noted, no agreed minutes are recorded of this meeting. The SCAAP is planning for growth and inward investment and seeks to attract greater visitor numbers.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2155	Comment	Interestingly the representations made by the Seafront businesses in Blackpool persuaded the Government Inspector of their position. The Inspector concluded in their report that 'Car Parks need to accommodate peak weekend/bank holiday parking'.	Noted. This quotation could not be cited within the Blackpool Inspectors Report. The Council has nevertheless noted the modifications made by the Inspector.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2178	Object	RICS paper 'High Streets Adapting for Change' discusses parking changes and out of town retail which provides free parking. In contrast to this Since 2007 many local authorities have increased parking charges significantly. In the SCAAP area this is a key issue which requires essential review. This is in contrast to the smaller districts of wider Southend on Sea, Leigh and Southchurch where the Council have extended free parking to 2 hours. Compared to Central Southend and the SCAAP area where parking for 2 hours is in excess of £3.30. In Stockvale Group's view this is a deterrent for people coming into Southend particularly for shopping. This combined with the poor spatial and environmental quality is a contributing factor to the decline of Southend's Town Centre.	The SCAAP recognises the importance of car parking provision to the vitality and viability of the centre. The SCAAP is a planning policy document and does not directly cover parking charges. The wider implications of car parking charges are a matter which will be kept under review by the Borough Council at part of its overall approach to car parking for the Borough. No changes are proposed.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2188	Support	Wholeheartedly support the encouragement and expansion of businesses in the Southend Central Area, although note that the issues around transport, access and parking need further consideration and understanding.	Noted.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2189	Object	Transport, access and parking issues need further consideration and are a particular issue for the Seafront businesses and the tourist economy. The high way infrastructure makes journeys into the town prolonged and difficult. Many visitors and customers simply don't return.	<p>Policy DS5 and related Policy Areas include a number of proposals for improving transport accessibility. These policies will sit alongside the Local Transport Plan which aims to address issues of congestion, circulation and accessibility to Southend to assist economic growth.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2193	Comment	Southend's Unique Selling Point is the Seafront which is a destination of choice. The Seafront and High Street inter relate on each other for business with the major attractions of Southend relying on easy access to car parking and good access from the car parks to the High Street and the Seafront attractions by foot or public transport.	Noted. The SCAAP seeks to improve and enhance connectivity between the seafront and town centre. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2194	Comment	Access into the Town is problematic certainly on peak days, but also in evenings when there are events on in the Town and Central Seafront. There is a view that from the Victoria Gateway junction to the Raleigh Weir on days of high visitation and sunny days the key route is completely grid locked between these two key points. This represents somewhere in the region of 3840 cars parked nose to tail across the main artery into the Town which is mainly a dual carriageway.	Accessibility improvements are on-going as part of the implementation of the Local Transport Plan and other regeneration initiatives. No changes are proposed.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2195	Comment	<p>Some members of the BID and representatives of the Seafront businesses believe that one way in which the congestion into the Town could be improved is for an additional 3840 parking spaces to be made accessible and available within close proximity to the Seafront and core High Street Area. This is due to the day visitor attraction industry, particularly family attractions such as the Seafront receiving the vast majority of its income in a few weeks of the year. These generally coincide with the school holidays. During this peak period a visitor attraction business needs to be able to accommodate every visitor that wants to visit as these peak days effectively subsidise the operation for the rest of the year.</p> <p>If the access to the main attractions is limited on peak days by the availability of car parking spaces, this could and does have serious impact on the viability of the Seafront businesses. The main parking areas are generally at capacity on peak holiday periods. Any loss of capacity as a result of the SCAAP proposals would result in a cap of visitors during these peak periods. This the amount of investment within the Seafront to the current status quo. Transport and access is not just limited to the Seafront and does have a huge impact on the High Street, combined with parking tariffs, access and egress, and poor legibility around the Town Centre. Whilst the changes outlined in the SCAAP from a space and use perspective will do an awful lot to reinvigorate and regenerate the High Street, this must be inclusive of a renewed and fresh approach to parking provision within the SCAAP Area.</p>	<p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
----------------------------	--	------	---------	--	---

Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2199	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there has been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The BID would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2207	Comment	<p>Before the SCAAP document is enshrined, the BID would ask that the Council carry out thorough research, analysis and investigation into the capabilities of the existing infrastructure and the capabilities of utility suppliers to meet the aspirational growth. This is essential and will need some degree of consideration in terms of new sub stations around the SCAAP area. This directly links to townscape and Public Realm improvements as these sub stations represent an opportunity to not create a negative space in the overall townscape. Many of the Members of the BID are continuously seeking to improve their offer and find that the limitation of the existing utilities coming into the SCAAP area prohibit their future plans and proposals. This has not been at all addressed in the SCAAP document.</p>	Infrastructure provision, particularly flood risk management, which has been a major issue in the central seafront area, is addressed in the Plan. Such provisions have been subject to consultation with utility companies as part of the Plan preparation process. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2213	Comment	<p>There is the further opportunity to reopen the deepening alleviating some of the traffic stress that has resulted of the Highway alterations</p>	Noted. The Deeping was closed some years ago as part of transport improvements to the area. Its future use will be kept under review as part of on-going transport monitoring.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2229	Comment	<p>There are a couple of issues that the BID want to ensure are adequately addressed through the SCAAP. The first of those is the potential of having residents parking zones, this could have a negative effect on the existing Town Centre on and off street parking and consume spaces that are vital for visitors.</p>	Noted. Such aspects will be kept under review as part of the on-going transport monitoring of the area.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2245	Comment	Transport and Access and Public Realm also received 70% of respondents giving this a score of 10 and a top priority.	Noted.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2268	Object	Major concerns relating to all supported aspirations being achieved falls into a number of categories, transport, access and parking is a key theme and at present the existing parking provision is woefully inadequate. The access route into the Town is often unable to cater for the number of visitors on sunny days and this is likely to be detrimental to economic sustainability and the projected growth of 6,000 jobs within the SCAAP Area.	<p>Policy PA5 and related Policy Areas make a number of proposals for the improvement of transport and accessibility in the central area. No changes are proposed.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
Question 17; Policy DS5	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2269	Object	The identified opportunity development sites are mainly existing public car parks. Through the SCAAP the Local Authority should seek a minimum of a replacement like for like number of public spaces on each of the sites whilst also meeting the development requirements in accordance with the Council's Development Management Policy.	<p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p> <p>The Development Management Document establishes maximum parking standards for commercial development and appropriate standards for residential development in the Central Area. The amount of parking provided for a development scheme will be assessed against these policy standards, together with a consideration of the sites local context, location and distance from public transport links.</p>
Question 17; Policy DS5	Mr Rod Levin[497]	2271	Comment	Provision of pavement seating throughout the borough	The Plan seeks to improve existing and provide new public spaces within Southend Central Area. Seating provision will be considered on a scheme by scheme basis in line with the Streetscape Manual Supplementary Planning Document. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2276	Comment	Upgrade the Street lighting from the current dismal effect	A programme of street lighting improvements is being implemented as part of the Local Transport Plan provisions. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2279	Comment	Reduce / eliminate all car-parking charges on Sundays and Bank holidays and, hospital car parks completely	The SCAAP recognises the importance of car parking provision to the vitality and viability of the centre. The wider implications of car parking charges are a matter which will be kept under review by the Borough Council as part of its overall car parking strategy for the Borough. No changes are proposed.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2280	Comment	Ensure all new houses are provided with car parking room for at least two cars	Residential car parking is set out in the Council's adopted car parking standards in the Development Management Document. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2284	Comment	Plan to improve Road access to Southend (Additional to A127) by 2020	A number of road improvements to the strategic highway network have been completed in recent years and further improvements are proposed as part of the Local Transport Plan provisions. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2285	Comment	Plan week-end Park and ride scheme for visitors by road to leave their cars Out-of-Town	Park and Ride schemes have been considered a number of times in recent years but have not been considered feasible given the limited land available and linear peninsula geography of the town. The provision of Park and Ride would only be feasible outside the SCAAP boundaries. Such options will be kept under review as part of the on-going Local Transport Plan provisions and development of the Southend Local Plan. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2286	Comment	As in towns abroad, make commercial deliveries to be during Night hours only - eg: Monaco	Commercial delivery times are kept under review as part of on-going traffic management proposals. The SCAAP Transport, Access and Public Realm Strategy and Policy DS5 seeks to ensure the efficient and effective servicing and delivery arrangements. No changes are proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2306	Comment	Policy DS5 states that the Council will work with the freight industry and logistics to implement more efficient use of vehicles in terms of guidance, zoning and delivery timetables and suggests that this can be set out in freight management plans. Valad (Europe) Ltd suggest that the requirement for freight management plans is not set out in policy but dealt with on a case by case basis.	Policy purely sets out intent to provide for a freight management plan in the interests of efficient traffic management. No changes are proposed.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2343	Object	<p>Vulnerable groups' need transport and the statement that car travel is to be discouraged is discriminatory against those of us who cannot get on public transport and need cars <i>for</i> accessibility to all areas of the town and the profoundly disabled who use nothing else, not only motability cars but blue badge users and those taken by friends or taxis. Also need to be relief areas for guide and assistance dogs. The Southend Local Transport Plan 3 to 2026 notes as a Key Fact p87 the expected rise in population over 65 and that all public transport should be accessible by 2017 which does not appear likely. It also notes the lack of buses along the seafront.</p>	<p>The SCAAP does not seek to discourage car travel, rather it seeks to encourage and promote better public transport. The Local Transport Plan seeks to promote public transport for all, including concessionary fares for those of retirement age.</p> <p>Site occupiers with reference to national parking guidance and legislation are responsible for providing an adequate number of spaces for people with disabilities. The SCAAP seeks to promote a positive approach to public car parking provision that provides public car parking levels that support the vitality of the town centre and access to the seafront by encouraging improvements to the quality of access to parking so that it is convenient, well-signposted, safe and secure. It is considered that reference to a range of parking types, including for disabled people, should be made within Policy DS5.</p>
Question 17; Policy DS5	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2344	Object	<p>Reducing car parking space, particularly in the streets, is nonsense. Some of the spaces calculated have been within shopping malls such as the Royals. Local businesses need short term spaces for their customers including care agencies, accountants, lawyers etc. if clients do not find somewhere to park nearby, e.g Clarence Rd. area, the business will relocate somewhere else. This could have an effect upon employment considered elsewhere in the plan and under threat. Disabled people need nearby spaces. So do people with shopping and mums with children. Multi storey car parks are not good for those with walking difficulty or indeed women on their own for safety in darkness.</p> <p>Going to park in a multi storey or driving around for a space just to have lunch in a cafe in The High Street opposite Marks and Spencers does not make sense for boosting the town economy at all.</p> <p>The car park next to SAVS building is vital for users of that building and the meetings and workshops there. It also gives access to the Royals complex without having to drive around to the Royals car park where there is often long waiting to get in especially on Saturdays and when it is raining. Likewise the Clarence Road car park is vital for the residents and business people around there and of course the Baptist Church and Salvation Army.</p>	<p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p> <p>Policy seeks to better manage demand on the road network and balance this with the needs of other modes, particularly where this would give greater reliability to road users and priority to pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and other vulnerable road users.</p> <p>The SCAAP seeks to promote a positive approach to public car parking provision that provides public car parking levels that support the vitality of the town centre and access to the seafront by encouraging improvements to the quality of access to parking so that it is convenient, well-signposted, safe and secure. It is considered that reference to a range of parking types, including for disabled people, should be made within Policy DS5.</p>

Question 17; Policy DS5	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2345	Comment	The travel centre and management of access to buses is hopeless. Real consultation on the location of the travel centre and safe places for people to wait and queue for buses is overdue. Good and accessible public toilets should be incorporated here and elsewhere in the central area.	Policy PA7 identifies the potential to relocate the bus station to provide for improved facilities. The detailed design of a scheme will be considered at planning application stage and will be subject to consultation. No changes proposed.
Question 17 DS5	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2366	Comment	Would LGO's please stop using the term 'public transport' We only have private companies operating trains and buses.	'Public transport' is a term generally used to refer to transport services provided directly to the public. No change proposed.
Question 17 DS5	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2367	Support	Yes, but we need 24/7 concessionary fares for old aged pensioners	Concessionary fares are a matter outside of planning influence. No changes proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2375	Comment	Southend-On-Sea needs more innovative transport solutions. Other cities such as Manchester etc have reverted back to the tram system and park and ride schemes. There is no connectivity from rail other than car or walking. To resurrect a tram system would not only provide an efficient form of transport but enhance the sea side feel that Southend is missing. Parking is also an issue and any new development should provide a self-sufficient parking solution and stop commercial and retail parking in residential areas	The Plan seeks to enhance and improve public transport within the central area. Innovative transport solutions have been investigated as part of the Local Transport Plan. All development schemes are assessed against adopted car parking standards. No changes proposed.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2377	Comment	Southend-On-Sea central area is poorly lit and pedestrian routes for commuters from Southend Central station are seen as unsafe. Most commuters will travel in the hours of darkness whether it be morning or night and to encourage walking around the central areas better lighting is required.	Policy DS5 seeks to ensure the provision of appropriate street lighting. Reference will be included for improved lighting in Policy PA1.

Question 17; Policy DS5	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2379	Comment	The central area is highly residential and traffic speed is too high; especially in the residential areas of Clifftown. Traffic calming options should be installed to reduce traffic speed in these areas.	Policy DS5 seeks to improve traffic management within the central area. However, it is recognised that the Policy makes no reference to the potential to improve the road safety and environment of the pockets of predominantly residential areas within the central area. It is therefore proposed that the following criteria is added to Policy DS5, <u>'Improve road safety and the quality of the environment by introducing traffic calming and related measures within predominantly residential areas as appropriate.'</u> Policy PA6.5.b seeks a reduction in general vehicle circulation in residential street.
Question 17; Policy DS5	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2388	Comment	1 parking space per flat is totally unrealistic in this age	The Councils parking standards are set out in the Development Management Document and these have been found sound by a planning inspector and subsequently adopted.
Question 17; Policy DS5	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2433	Comment	All pedestrian areas should be kept free of obstacles, and no cycling should be allowed in these areas. All walking areas should be well lit, and where there are seats they should be so positioned that they do not cause a hazard.	Policy seeks to give priority to pedestrians, cyclists, public transport and other vulnerable users. It also seeks to maintain street lighting. Reference will be included to Policy DS5 to ensure that public realm improvements consider the needs of more vulnerable users as follows: <u>'In order to promote and reinforce local distinctiveness, ensure all public realm improvement works, including those outlined in the relevant Policy Areas, should seek to provide a coordinated palette of materials, facilitate a reduction in street clutter, consider the needs of all users including vulnerable and disabled users, the provision of additional seating where appropriate to provide resting places, and have regard to guidance within the Design and Townscape Guide and Streetscape Manual.'</u>
Question 17; Policy DS5	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2434	Comment	Parking should be provided for disabled drivers close to shops. There is no mention of parking for disabled people in the document.	Site occupiers with reference to national parking guidance and legislation are responsible for providing an adequate number of spaces for people with disabilities The SCAAP seeks to promote a positive approach to public car parking provision that provides public car parking levels that support the vitality of the town centre and access to the seafront by encouraging improvements to the quality of access to parking so that it is convenient, well-signposted, safe and secure. It is considered that reference to a range of parking types, including for disabled people, should be made within Policy DS5.

Question 17; Policy DS5	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2435	Comment	There should be bus routes to cover all parts of the town these should be reliable, frequent, accessible and available 7 days a week and at Bank holidays. Currently there are no bus routes from Chalkwell to the Kursaal.	Policy DS5, as part of a sustainable approach to transport, seeks to improve provisions for public transport users and for bus priority measures. Specific bus routes are considered as part of on-going partnership working with bus operators. No changes are proposed.
Infrastructure Provision					
Question 18	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1947	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to providing infrastructure in Southend Central Area	Noted.
Question 18	Anglian Water (Sue Ball) [37]	2015	Comment	Treatment capacity at Southend Water Recycling Centre is available to serve the proposed level of growth in the plan.(Infrastructure Provision 4.12 paragraph 139)	Noted
Question 18	Anglian Water (Sue Ball) [37]	2016	Comment	There may be a need for upgrades to the foul sewerage network to accommodate the used water flows from the proposed development. (Infrastructure Provision 4.12 paragraph 140) This will be assessed for each site when we are approached via our pre planning service and a solution identified. Details can be found at: http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/pre-planning-service-.aspx . Developers should be encouraged to submit a pre planning enquiry at the earliest opportunity.	Noted
Question 18	Anglian Water (Sue Ball) [37]	2027	Comment	For Surface water disposal we would expect a SuDS solution to be utilised where at all viable and under no circumstances will surface water be permitted to discharge into the foul sewerage system. (Infrastructure Provision 4.12 paragraph 140)	Noted. It is proposed to add to Policy DS4 point 2 the following: <u>'...Under no circumstances will surface water be permitted to discharge into a separate foul sewer or sewerage system. Surface runoff that cannot be discharged into the ground, a surface water body or a surface water sewer or local highway drain, must be discharged to a public, combined sewer system.'</u>


Question 18	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2095	Support	<p>The STOCKVALE GROUP understand the concept of a much greater residential intensification of the SCAAP area and would wholeheartedly support the Councils aspirations for an additional 4000+ homes however, this must be in the context of insuring there is suitable amenity and infrastructure.</p> <p>The intensification together with a greater mix of uses in the Town Centre and Central Seafront create a much more buoyant and sustainable economy and the STOCKVALE GROUP welcome the Councils proposals as part of the SCAAP planning document.</p>	<p>Noted. It is proposed to amend paragraph 139 as follows: <u>‘Water companies are subject to a statutory duty to ‘effectually drain’ their area. This requires them to invest in infrastructure suitable to meet the demands of projected population growth. Southend Waste Water Treatment Works has adequate capacity to accommodate the Core Strategy growth targets to 2021 and beyond. However, developers will need to consider the effect of their development on the capacity of the local waste water network. Proposals will need to demonstrate that they will not overload this.’</u></p> <p>It is also proposed to insert a new paragraph under 139:</p> <p><u>‘There is statutory provision for developers to fund additional sewerage infrastructure required to accommodate flows from a proposed development. Adequate sewerage infrastructure should be in place to serve the area before development progresses. Developers should seek pre-planning advice from Anglian Water at the earliest opportunity to ensure appropriate provision is made. Further details and useful guidance can be found on Anglian Water’s website.’</u></p>
Question 18	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2105	Comment	<p>Before the SCAAP document is enshrined, the STOCKVALE GROUP would ask that the Council carry out thorough research, analysis and investigation into the capabilities of the existing infrastructure and the capabilities of utility suppliers to meet the aspirational growth. This is essential and will need some degree of consideration in terms of new sub stations around the SCAAP area. This directly links to townscape and Public Realm improvements as these sub stations represent an opportunity to not create a negative space in the overall townscape. Many of the Members of the STOCKVALE GROUP are continuously seeking to improve their offer and find that the limitation of the existing utilities coming into the SCAAP area prohibit their future plans and proposals. This has not been at all addressed in the SCAAP document.</p>	<p>Infrastructure provision is addressed in the Plan. Such provisions have been subject to consultation with utility companies as part of Plan preparation process. No changes are proposed.</p> <p>Further consultation with the National Grid will reveal whether further capacity is required to support the additional development in the central area. There was no objection from the National Grid to the housing and job targets in the Core Strategy.</p>

Question 18	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2198	Support	The BID understand the concept of a much greater residential intensification of the SCAAP area and would wholeheartedly support the Councils aspirations for an additional 4000+ homes however, this must be in the context of insuring there is suitable amenity and infrastructure. The intensification together with a greater mix of uses in the Town Centre and Central Seafront create a much more buoyant and sustainable economy and the BID welcome the Councils proposals as part of the SCAAP planning document.	Noted.
Question 18	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2208	Comment	Before the SCAAP document is enshrined, the BID would ask that the Council carry out thorough research, analysis and investigation into the capabilities of the existing infrastructure and the capabilities of utility suppliers to meet the aspirational growth. This is essential and will need some degree of consideration in terms of new sub stations around the SCAAP area. This directly links to townscape and Public Realm improvements as these sub stations represent an opportunity to not create a negative space in the overall townscape. Many of the Members of the BID are continuously seeking to improve their offer and find that the limitation of the existing utilities coming into the SCAAP area prohibit their future plans and proposals. This has not been at all addressed in the SCAAP document.	Infrastructure provision, particularly flood risk management, which has been a major issue in the central seafront area, is addressed in the Plan. Such provisions have been subject to consultation with utility companies as part of the Plan preparation process. No changes are proposed.
Question 18	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2249	Comment	Energy and Utilities 32% top priority.	Noted.
Question 18	Mr Alan Grubb [59]	2294	Comment	The nearest Health Centre is located in North Road Westcliff, will this health centre be able to handle the additional demand which would be created by the new developments, The old Ekco site, Roots Hall site, the old college site next to the Civic Centre, Heath House and Carby House.	The Plan recognises the potential need for additional community facilities, particularly in the Queensway, Victoria and Sutton Gateway policy areas (Policies PA4, PA8, PA9). No changes are proposed.
Question 18	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2368	Support	Yes, any new school may decide to convert to an Academy	Noted.

Question 18	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2392	Comment	Southend-On-Sea Council should ensure that all new developments both business and residential have Fibre optic ultra high speed broadband infrastructure as standard. This will attract future business and technologies to the city. The Council should be the city to make Southend On Sea the first 100% fibre High speed broadband city in uk. This upgrade of communication across the city along with a wi-fi infrastructure as seen in cities across Romania (yes Romania) would make Southend extremely attractive to global business with high speed Broadband communications being a pinch point for companies across the UK both large and small.	The adopted Core Strategy (CP1) sets out provision for improving broadband infrastructure throughout the Borough.
Question 18	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2436	Comment	There is no mention of Public toilets or day centres for disabled people.	These are referred to in the Plan under the generic term 'community infrastructure'. No changes to Plan are proposed.

Part C: Policy Areas and Opportunity Sites

Dwelling Capacity

Question 19	The Co-operative Group (Mr A Thompson) [473]	1971	Object	The Co-operative Group would wish to see the inclusion of land at 53-57 Sutton Road Southend within the SCAAP as an additional Opportunity Site.		The Council is considering inclusion of this site as an opportunity site. This will be assessed against information supplied by the owners of the site to demonstrate that development is deliverable by 2021.
-------------	--	------	--------	--	--	--

High Street Policy Area – Policy PA1; Opportunity Sites 1 and 2

Question 20 PA1	Anna Hyndnan Lahna [456]	1931	Comment	With regards to the invitation to comment on new plans for Southend High Street, I would like to propose that we introduce trees in an avenue style right down the centre of the pedestrianised area.	Policy PA1 seeks to provide for improved landscaping and 'urban greening' and tree planting in the High Street. No changes proposed.
Question 20 PA1	Anna Hyndnan Lahna [456]	1932	Comment	I think we need to bring the area more glamour. I think we need to curb the amount of pound and temporary shops. We need to encourage individual businesses along with higher class chains, Brown Brasseries for example.	Policy PA1 seeks to encourage development that would contribute to the vitality and viability of the town centre. No changes proposed.

Question 20 PA1	Anna Hyndnan Lahna [456]	1933	Comment	Southend has a reputation for being for being downtrodden and cheap but it needn't be, we could follow the lead of Brighton for example and encourage boutique style shops and bring up the standards.	Policy PA1 seeks to encourage development that would contribute to the vitality and viability of the town centre. No changes proposed.
Question 20 PA1	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1948	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the High Street Policy Area	Noted.
Question 20 PA1	London Southend Airport (Ms Jo Marchetti) [471]	1967	Support	<p>LSA would like to see improvements made to the top of the high street to entice passengers arriving from the airport via. Southend Victoria Station into the High Street area before making their way to the seafront.</p> <p>Better signage is needed to encourage visitors to many of the bars and restaurants located in the side streets.</p> <p>Better signage should be considered from the Queensway area to the High Street via. Odeon/New Look alleyway.</p>	Noted. The Plan makes provision for improved signage and way marking throughout the central area, however, it is not directly referred to in Policy PA1 (High Street) where quality signage is important. <i>It is therefore proposed that the following words be added to Policy PA1 3 d: ‘through improved signage and public art provision’.</i>
Question 20; PA1.3.c	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	1997	Support	Southend has been the focus of working class seaside attractions for at least 80 years and continues to be so. It is the mainstay of many seafront businesses. Those day trippers often take advantage of the sea front and the town centre facilities so improving the connectivity between the two is crucial.	Noted.

Question 20; PA1	Anglian Water (Sue Ball) [37]	2017	Comment	<p>We would recommend within each Policy Area a requirement is stipulated that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve the area before development progresses.</p>	<p>The Council understands that water companies are subject to a statutory duty to ‘effectually drain’ their area. This requires them to invest in infrastructure suitable to meet the demands of projected population growth. There is also statutory provision for developers to fund additional sewerage infrastructure required to fund additional sewerage from a proposed development. In relation to this Ofwat provides information for developers where a development would require a new water main or sewer. It is considered, therefore, that there is an obligation on water companies to ensure that sewerage infrastructure is provided to a level to meet housing target in an adopted plan, unless it is a circumstance where a development would be required to provide additional capacity.</p> <p>Specifically, for foul drainage, Section 42 of the Flood and Water Management Act requires developers who want to connect to a public sewer to enter into a binding agreement for the adoption of new connecting sewers by the undertaker (under section 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991). The agreement must specify that new sewers will be built to a standard published by the Minister, or any other such standard as may be agreed. (Review above)</p> <p>Reference to this has been included within section 4.12 Infrastructure Provision. As it is a statutory undertaking it is not considered necessary to repeat it in planning policy.</p> <p>Noted. Additional supporting text is proposed to be included in 4.12 Infrastructure Provision, referencing the need for developers to make provision for the foul sewerage network.</p>
---------------------	-------------------------------------	------	---------	---	--

Question 20	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2058	Comment	The Government has also introduced measures to make it easier to change use into residential however this is probably fairly restrictive in the High Street itself but Southend as the Local Planning Authority should consider the widening of that, certainly into some of the units off the High.	Policy DS1 and related Policy Area provisions actively promotes residential use above commercial premises and within proposed mixed use developments. No changes are proposed.
Question 20	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2063	Comment	High Streets Adapting for Change (RICS) introduces the Governments recognition that our High Streets have to offer something new and different that neither the shopping centres nor the internet can match. They need to offer an experience that goes beyond retail and they need to be a destination for the socialising culture, health, well being, creativity and learning. Offices alongside shops, alongside housing, alongside eateries.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this.

Question 20	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2072	Support	Support the Council in their aspiration to (i) improve Competitive Performance (ii) Reduce the cost base (iii) Diversify away from retail uses (iv) grow the local economy and/or population, which is a strong theme in the preferred option principle. Recognise that the High Street should be a social place that makes creative use of public space with a vibrant evening economy.	Noted.
Question 20	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2078	Comment	Many of our High Streets have been shaped by their past; however they are now trapped in their current configurations and often in poor shape to face the future. In relation to Southend on Sea, this is certainly the case. The High Street in particular has a linearity with no social space for congregation, interaction and the alternative commercial uses that would reactivate these spaces such as cafes, coffee shops, office space and importantly a high intensification of residential uses both at ground level and above The SCAAP and the Stockvale Group recognise that the High Street in particular requires a restructuring on a significant scale.	The SCAAP recognises the need to enhance and broaden the offer in the High Street and seeks to do this by providing a more flexible approach in the determination of planning applications to encourage a mix of retail, cafe and restaurant uses. The Plan also seeks to enhance and promote new public spaces within the centre. No changes are proposed.

Question 20	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2088	Support	Support a higher intensification of residential uses in the Central Area together with a broader mix of commercial uses ranging from A1 retail, A3 restaurant café, D2 leisure and B1 offices to provide a more diverse multi-use High Street and Central Seafront.	Noted.
Question 20	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2097	Comment	Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there have been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront. The STOCKVALE GROUP would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions. No changes are proposed.

Question 20	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2111	Comment	There is a great opportunity to display public art in terms of film projection on to the rear of the Victoria Plaza and the existing Odeon building. This further runs in to the top end of the High Street where there is a greater opportunity to enhance Victoria Circus.	<p>Noted. Additional wording is proposed to emphasise the use of visually active frontages within Policy PA2.2 as follows: <u>'Encourage visually active frontages, through public art, green walls, architectural fenestration to buildings on Queensway dual carriage-way'</u></p> <p>Include an additional criteria to Policy PA1 to encourage visually active frontage within PA1 to the rear of buildings on Queensway dual carriage way to read as follows: <u>'Encourage visually active frontages, through public art, green walls, and architectural fenestration to buildings on Queensway dual carriage way'</u></p>
Question 20	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2113	Comment	In relation to the middle of the High Street from Pitmans Close, Whitegate Road through to Tylers Avenue, the STOCKVALE GROUP support the extension of the education and cultural quarter into this area and would further suggest that the SCAAP looks at office use within the High Street itself and some residential uses above these offices. This would stimulate a broader economy and a safer pedestrian environment.	Noted. The SCAAP identifies a number of opportunities for achieving residential/office development within this locality. No changes are proposed.

Question 20	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2116	Comment	There could also be an improvement of pedestrian connection from the Central railway station of Southend on Sea into the Public Realm and a vast and extensive soft landscape scheme introduced around the Tylers Avenue/High Street connection to the railway station.	Noted. It is proposed that PA7 is updated as follows: ' <u>facilitate better pedestrian access to the High Street and Southend Central railway station</u> ' And the following amendment is proposed to PA6.3.b: 'streetscape and landscape design improvements, including urban greening and tree planting, to create well lit walking circuits through Clifftown from a newly created public plaza at Southend Central <u>Railway</u> Station/ Central House, to Cliff Gardens and Pier Hill, <u>facilitating better pedestrian access to the High Street</u> '
Question 20	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2119	Support	The STOCKVALE GROUP support the Public Realm improvements and further connectivity down through and into the Seafront. The STOCKVALE GROUP recognise that Pier Hill has had a huge success in this regard.	Noted.
Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2160	Comment	The Government has also introduced measures to make it easier to change use into residential however this is probably fairly restrictive in the High Street itself but Southend as the Local Planning Authority should consider the widening of that, certainly into some of the units off the High Street.	Policy PA1 and related Policy Area provisions promotes residential use above commercial premises and within proposed mixed use developments where appropriate. No changes are proposed.

Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2165	Comment	High Streets Adapting for Change (RICS) introduces the Governments recognition that our High Streets have to offer something new and different that neither the shopping centres nor the internet can match. They need to offer an experience that goes beyond retail and they need to be a destination for the socialising culture, health, well being, creativity and learning. Offices alongside shops, alongside housing, alongside eateries.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this.
Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2174	Support	Support the Council in their aspiration to (i) improve Competitive Performance (ii) Reduce the cost base (iii) Diversify away from retail uses (iv) grow the local economy and/or population, which is a strong theme in the preferred option principle. Recognises that the High Street should be a social place that makes creative use of public space with a vibrant evening economy	Noted.
Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2180	Comment	Many of our High Streets have been shaped by their past, however they are now trapped in their current configurations and often in poor shape to face the future. In relation to Southend on Sea, this is certainly the case. The High Street in particular has a linearity with no social space for congregation, interaction and the alternative commercial uses that would reactivate these spaces such as cafes, coffee shops, office space and importantly a high intensification of residential uses both at ground level and above. The SCAAP and the Stockvale Group recognise that the High Street in particular requires a restructuring on a significant scale.	The SCAAP recognises the need to enhance and broaden the offer in the High Street and seeks to do this by encouraging a mix of retail, cafe and restaurant uses. The Plan also seeks to enhance and promote new public spaces within the centre. No changes are proposed.
Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2191	Support	Support a higher intensification of residential uses in the Central Area together with a broader mix of commercial uses ranging from A1 retail, A3 restaurant café, D2 leisure and B1 offices to provide a more diverse multi-use High Street and Central Seafront.	Noted.

Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2200	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there has been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The BID would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions.
Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2214	Comment	<p>There is a great opportunity to display public art in terms of film projection on to the rear of the Victoria Plaza and the existing Odeon building. This further runs in to the top end of the High Street where there is a greater opportunity to enhance Victoria Circus.</p>	<p>Noted. Additional wording is proposed to emphasise the use of visually active frontages within Policy PA2.2 as follows: <u>'Encourage visually active frontages, through public art, green walls, fenestration to buildings on Queensway dual carriage way'</u></p> <p>It is proposed to include an additional criteria to Policy PA1 to encourage visually active frontages to the rear of buildings on Queensway dual-carriage way to read as follows: <u>'Encourage visually active frontages, through public art, green walls, and architectural fenestration to buildings on Queensway dual carriage way'</u></p>
Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2216	Comment	<p>In relation to the middle of the High Street from Pitmans Close, Whitegate Road through to Tylers Avenue, the BID support the extension of the education and cultural quarter into this area and would further suggest that the SCAAP looks at office use within the High Street itself and some residential uses above these offices. This would stimulate a broader economy and a safer pedestrian environment.</p>	Noted. The SCAAP identifies a number of opportunities for achieving residential/office development within this locality. No changes are proposed.

Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2219	Comment	There could also be an improvement of pedestrian connection from the Central railway station of Southend on Sea into the Public Realm and a vast and extensive soft landscape scheme introduced around the Tylers Avenue/High Street connection to the railway station.	<p>Noted. It is proposed that PA7 is updated as follows: <u>'facilitate better pedestrian access to the High Street and Southend Central railway station'</u></p> <p>And the following amendment is proposed to PA6.3.b: 'streetscape and landscape design improvements, including urban greening and tree planting, to create well lit walking circuits through Clifftown from a newly created public plaza at Southend Central Railway Station/ Central House, to Cliff Gardens and Pier Hill, facilitating better pedestrian access to the High Street'</p> <p>And the following amendment to PA6.3.b: 'streetscape and landscape design improvements, including urban greening and tree planting, to create well lit walking circuits through Clifftown from a newly created public plaza at Southend Central Railway Station/ Central House, to Cliff Gardens and Pier Hill, facilitating better pedestrian access to the High Street'</p>
Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2222	Support	The BID support the Public Realm improvements and further connectivity down through and into the Seafront. The BID recognise that Pier Hill has had a huge success in this regard.	Noted.
Question 20	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2251	Comment	84% of respondents scored the High Street as a top 10 priority	Noted.
Question 20; PA1	Mr Alan Grubb [59]	2298	Comment	Walking up the High Street I cannot help but notice the area where Elmer Approach joins the High Street there does not appear to be any signs directing the pedestrian to the new library (Forum).	The provision of signage in the town centre is reviewed as appropriate. The Plan makes provision for improved signage and way marking throughout the central area, however , it is not directly referred to in Policy PA1 (High Street) where quality signage is important. <i>It is therefore proposed that the following words be added to Policy PA1 3 d 'through improved signage and public art provision'.</i>

Question 20; PA1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2307	Comment	Policy PA1 seeks to enhance the High Street experience through a number of improvements such as improving, enhancing and creating new public spaces, improved landscaping and interlinking access roads. Our client requests that specific mention is made to the Council's aspiration to open up the southern façade of The Royals Shopping Centre through the provision of a new restaurant(s) and outdoor public space etc to create a link between the High Street and the Seafront area. This, together with improved signage and access would help to link the seafront with the town centre and High Street benefitting the town centre as a whole.	The Plan seeks to achieve this as set out in Policies PA 1 3c and Policy CS1 10b. It is proposed that an additional criteria is inserted into Policy PA1.2 outlining the Council's support for proposals that create active frontage on the southern façade of The Royals Shopping Centre as follows: ' <u>...the following, will be supported in principle... The provision of active frontage on the southern façade of The Royals Shopping Centre</u> '
Question 20; PA1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2308	Object	Opportunity sites 1 and 2 (Whitegate Road and Pitmans Close) have been identified as being suitable for mixed use office/residential, commercial uses, with the timescale for delivery being post 2021. The delivery timescales within which the development should be delivered should be brought forward with the aim of delivering it pre-2021 on the basis that it will bring further investment to the town centre sooner.	There is insufficient evidence that these sites will be delivered by 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period. They will however, be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan. No changes are proposed.
Question 20, PA1	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2369	Comment	Yes, more public toilets and any "steps" must be complimented by ramps for disabled people	Noted. This would be considered during the detailed design stage of any scheme.

Question 20; PA1	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2406	Comment	<p>Paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 relates to energy efficiency and relates to existing development. We note that versions of this paragraph appear under other policy areas and opportunity sites, so the following comments also apply.</p> <p>Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. Special considerations under Part L are also given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within registered parks and gardens and the curtilages of scheduled monuments, and buildings of traditional construction with permeable fabric that both absorbs and readily allows the evaporation of moisture. Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should note that the application will be different in relation to these classes of buildings. Further information can be found in the Historic England advice Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings –Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historically and traditionally constructed buildings https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-ptl/. <i>This similarly applies to Policy PA1, PA2, PA3, PA4, PA5, PA7, CS1, PA8 and PA9.</i></p>	<p>This point is noted. It is therefore proposed to reference this in paragraph 85 as follows: <i>‘It should be noted that listed buildings, buildings in Conservation Areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.’</i></p> <p>It is proposed to add the words ‘as appropriate’ in paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 so that it reads, <i>‘Promote energy efficiency as appropriate, including.....’</i></p> <p>This would necessitate similar changes to all other policy areas.</p>
Question 20	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2438	Comment	The High street should be kept at one level.	The High Street is predominantly at one level and elevators/lifts are provided at the multi-level Victoria Shopping Centre. A public lift was also constructed as part of wider regeneration proposals at the southern end of the High Street to improve accessibility between the differing levels of the High Street and the seafront.
London Road Policy Area – Policy PA2					
Question 21, PA2	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1949	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the London Road Policy Area	Noted.

Question 21; PA2	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	2003	Comment	I have no problem with London Road policy area except in one regard, the proposal for an active frontage along the dual carriageway. It is inconceivable that one would wish to encourage footfall along a busy dual carriageway. Far better to improve and emphasise London road as the focus for pedestrian traffic with the enhanced pedestrianisation. By all means improve the appearance but to create active frontages is wrong.	Noted, OS15 Sainsburys & Adjacent Building Site will not be in the final version of the SCAAP as it is unlikely to be implemented by 2021. It is proposed that Policy PA2 will be amended to encourage visually active frontage on Queensway dual-carriage way as follows: <u>'Encourage visually active frontages, through public art, green walls, and architectural fenestration to buildings on Queensway dual carriage way'</u>
Question 21; PA2	Cllr Nevin [489]	2012	Comment	London Road public toilets please so that traders don't bear the brunt of urinating doorways, a bench with public art/sculpture near to roundabout or top of Princes Street and pedestrianize as much as possible.	In setting out broad development principles for London Road, Policy PA3 seeks the provision of public art. However, the provision of toilets will not be addressed in the SCAAP, this would be considered during the detailed design stage of future development proposals.
Question 21; PA2	Anglian Water (Sue Ball) [37]	2018	Comment	We would recommend within each Policy Area a requirement is stipulated that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve the area before development progresses.	Refer to Rep. 2017. Reference to this has been included within section 4.12 Infrastructure Provision. As it is a statutory undertaking it is not considered necessary to repeat it in planning policy. Noted. Additional supporting is proposed to be included in 4.12 Infrastructure Provision, referencing the need for developers to make provision for the foul sewerage network.
Question 21	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2060	Support	Recognise-the importance of the Town Centre in viability and vitality terms and the need to enhance the existing markets where appropriate and introduce and create new markets.	Noted.

Question 21	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2064	Comment	High Streets Adapting for Change (RICS) introduces the Governments recognition that our High Streets have to offer something new and different that neither the shopping centres nor the internet can match. They need to offer an experience that goes beyond retail and they need to be a destination for the socialising culture, health, well being, creativity and learning. Offices alongside shops, alongside housing, alongside eateries.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this.
Question 21	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2079	Comment	Both the Council and Stockvale Group recognise the need to diversify the uses within the Central Area and indeed cite the success of London Road eateries. However, this needs to have some further consideration in relation to pedestrianising the stub-end of London Road, introducing a series of stalls that would allow for street food to further define this zone as a place that people come to enjoy, to eat, to meet and to use the cinema, which would include a reconfiguration and animation around Victoria Circus bleeding across into the northern end of the High Street.	The SCAAP seeks to achieve this in Policy PA2. No changes are proposed.

Question 21	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2098	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there have been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The STOCKVALE GROUP would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions. No changes are proposed.
Question 21	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2109	Comment	<p>The STOCKVALE GROUP would further make recommendation that there is an opportunity lost on the Victoria Gateway Public Realm Improvements and the large public space should be activated with a small commercial use and extensive landscaping and planting.</p>	<p>The Victoria Avenue/ Queensway junction has benefitted from significant public realm and access improvements as part as the implemented Victoria Gateway Scheme. However, it is considered that policy should still seek further improvements to the public realm and accessibility. Therefore the following amendments in Policy PA2.7.g. are proposed: <i><u>'seek provision of public art and integrated signage that combine with more traditional signage to signal entry to the Town Centre from Victoria Gateway and facilitate clear way-finding to improve legibility and pedestrian access, together with further improvements to the public realm and accessibility.'</u></i></p>

Question 21	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2112	Comment	There is a great opportunity to display public art in terms of film projection on to the rear of the Victoria Plaza and the existing Odeon building. This further runs in to the top end of the High Street where there is a greater opportunity to enhance Victoria Circus.	<p>Additional wording proposed to emphasise the use of visually active frontage within Policy PA2.2 as follows: '<u>Encourage visually active frontages, through public art, green walls, and architectural fenestration to buildings on Queensway dual carriage way</u>'</p> <p>Include an additional criteria to Policy PA1 to encourage visually active frontage within PA1 to the rear of buildings on Queensway dual-carriage way to read as follows: '<u>Encourage visually active frontages, through public art, green walls, and architectural fenestration to buildings on Queensway dual carriage way</u>'</p>
Question 21	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2122	Comment	In relation to the existing Sainsburys site and redevelopment of the whole block OS15. This is a site that could take a significantly higher building to cater for a larger number of residential units, complementing the Victoria Gateway proposals to re-use the redundant office space to residential. Fantastic views are offered here and the larger number of residential units would sustain the A3 restaurant and café uses around the top end of the High Street and stub end of London Road. This all needs to be considered in relation to adequate onsite parking provision, greater connectivity to public transport and a greatly enhanced Public Realm. The Stockvale Group would call for the Council to present design codes to ensure the design quality of development meets the Councils high aspirations.	<p>Noted. Opportunity Site 15 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021. Nevertheless the development principles as set out in Policy PA2, in combination with other adopted local policy and guidance, will provide the necessary framework to guide development proposals in this area.</p>

Question 21	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2123	Comment	The stub end of London Road should be landscaped and enhanced to include mature tree planting as a boulevard into Victoria Circus. The A3 restaurant and café uses at the top end of the High Street have been a huge success and through the SCAAP document this could be further encouraged with the inclusion of some small stalls to encourage street food and pop up food outlets centred around a large kiosk or amphitheatre at Victoria Circus. These small pavilions could then spread to the northern quadrant of the High Street. This would further stimulate the eastern end of London Road and the top end of the High Street as a destination for eateries and later entertainment to extend the evening economy.	Noted. These aspects are incorporated into Policies PA1 and PA2.
Question 21	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2162	Support	Recognise the importance of the Town Centre in viability and vitality terms and the need to enhance the existing markets where appropriate and introduce and create new markets	Noted.
Question 21	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2166	Comment	High Streets Adapting for Change (RICS) introduces the Government's recognition that our High Streets have to offer something new and different that neither the shopping centres nor the internet can match. They need to offer an experience that goes beyond retail and they need to be a destination for the socialising culture, health, well being, creativity and learning. Offices alongside shops, alongside housing, alongside eateries.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this.
Question 21	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2181	Comment	Both the Council and the BID recognise the need to diversify the uses within the Central Area and indeed cite the success of London Road eateries. However, this needs to have some further consideration in relation to pedestrianising the stub-end of London Road, introducing a series of stalls that would allow for street food to further define this zone as a place that people come to enjoy, to eat, to meet and to use the cinema, which would include a reconfiguration and animation around Victoria Circus bleeding across into the northern end of the High Street.	The SCAAP seeks to achieve this in Policy PA2. No changes are proposed.

Question 21	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2201	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there has been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The BID would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions.
Question 21	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2211	Support	<p>Wholeheartedly support the improvement on Victoria Avenue as a gateway in to the Town. The BID recognises that much of this work is already underway with the on-going redevelopment of Heath and Carby House.</p>	Noted. The Victoria Avenue/ Queensway junction has benefitted from significant public realm and access improvements as part as the implemented Victoria Gateway Scheme. However, it is considered that policy should still seek further improvements to the public realm and accessibility.
Question 21	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2212	Comment	<p>The STOCKVALE GROUP would further make recommendation that there is an opportunity lost on the Victoria Gateway Public Realm Improvements and the large public space should be activated with a small commercial use and extensive landscaping and planting.</p>	<p>The Victoria Avenue/ Queensway junction has benefitted from significant public realm and access improvements as part as the implemented Victoria Gateway Scheme. However, it is considered that policy should still seek further improvements to the public realm and accessibility. Therefore the following amendments are proposed to Policy PA2.7.g.: <i>'seek provision of public art and integrated signage that combine with more traditional signage to signal entry to the Town Centre from Victoria Gateway and facilitate clear way-finding to improve legibility and pedestrian access, together with further improvements to the public realm and accessibility.'</i></p>

Question 21	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2215	Comment	There is a great opportunity to display public art in terms of film projection on to the rear of the Victoria Plaza and the existing Odeon building. This further runs in to the top end of the High Street where there is a greater opportunity to enhance Victoria Circus.	<p>Additional wording proposed to emphasis the use of visually active frontage within Policy PA2.2 as follows: <u>‘Encourage visually active frontages, through public art, green walls, and architectural fenestration to buildings on Queensway dual carriage way’</u></p> <p>Include an additional criteria to Policy PA1 to encourage visually active frontage within PA1 to the rear of buildings on Queensway dual-carriage way to read as follows: <u>‘Encourage visually active frontages, through public art, green walls, and architectural fenestration to buildings on Queensway dual carriage way’</u></p>
Question 21	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2225	Comment	In relation to the existing Sainsburys site and redevelopment of the whole block OS15. This is a site that could take a significantly higher building to cater for a larger number of residential units, complementing the Victoria Gateway proposals to re-use the redundant office space to residential. Fantastic views are offered here and the larger number of residential units would sustain the A3 restaurant and café uses around the top end of the High Street and stub end of London Road. This all needs to be considered in relation to adequate onsite parking provision, greater connectivity to public transport and a greatly enhanced Public Realm. The BID would call for the Council to present design codes to ensure the design quality of development meets the Councils high aspirations.	<p>Noted. Opportunity Site 15 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP’s plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021. Nevertheless the development principles as set out in Policy PA2, in combination with other adopted local policy and guidance, will provide the necessary framework to guide development proposals in this area.</p>
Question 21	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2226	Comment	The stub end of London Road mature tree planting as a boulevard into Victoria Circus. The A3 restaurant and café uses at the top end of the High Street have been a huge success and through the SCAAP document this could be further encouraged with the inclusion of some small stalls to encourage street food and pop up food outlets centred around a large kiosk or amphitheatre at Victoria Circus. These small pavilions could then spread to the northern quadrant of the High Street. This would further stimulate the eastern end of London Road and the top end of the High Street as a destination for eateries and later entertainment to extend the evening economy.	Noted. These aspects are incorporated into Policies PA1 and PA2
Question 21	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2253	Comment	34% scored the London Road as a top 10 priority.	Noted.

Question 21, PA2	Mr Alan Grubb [59]	2295	Comment	<p>In connection with the shared space located outside Southend Victoria Rail Station, I did raise this issue at the time of the redevelopment, saying that in my opinion in order to reduce the possibility of accidents to pedestrians crossing to and from the rail station, Victorian style metal railings could be erected on the feeder road outside the station, the railings should extend from the main entrance of the station, extending down to the area outside the British Transport Police car park and corresponding railings on the opposite side with a gap at the bus stops and a gap in each of the railing outside the side entrance to the rail station with a pedestrian controlled facility. Although some trees have been planted at Victoria Circus, they are not mature enough to attract the wild life (Birds) More trees do need to be planted but the trees do need to be semi matured and be able to support wild life.</p> <p>My comments refer to the road part of the shared access which takes buses from Victoria Avenue into the bus stops outside the side entrance of the rail station this part of the road is also being used by drivers of vehicles who are using Victoria Avenue to access the ring road without using the traffic light at Victoria Circus.</p> <p>There does need to be signs before the start of this section of the road restricting the drivers other than bus or taxi drivers from using this area of road together with A N P R cameras. The problem is further compounded by unauthorised vehicles using the road in the opposite direction. The problem is further compounded by some vehicle owners/ delivery drivers parking their vehicles on the pavement before the side entrance to the Rail station thereby blocking the visibility of the pedestrian who is wishing to cross the road from the station.</p>	The workings of the 'shared space' outside Victoria Railway Station will be kept under review as part of the on-going traffic monitoring of the area. No changes are proposed.
Question 21; PA2.7a	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2346	Object	<p>Policy PA2.7a - Pedestrianisation of that section of road will make life extremely difficult for anyone with mobility problems and prevent access to cafes shops and the Odeon as detailed elsewhere.</p>	Any pedestrianisation scheme will take into account the needs of vulnerable road users. These issues will be further considered during the detailed design and implementation stage of the scheme. No changes proposed.

Question 21; PA2.7b	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2347	Object	Policy PA2.7b - Relocating the taxis will be discriminatory and taxis to the West of College Way will really leave anyone with a walking difficulty stranded. This proposal could sound attractive but has not been properly thought through. There are not enough disabled parking spaces along there now and removing them really hits the Equality legislation.	Any pedestrianisation scheme will take into account the needs of vulnerable road users and taxi provision. These issues will be further considered during the detailed design and implementation stage of the scheme. No changes proposed.
Question 21; PA2.7g	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2348	Comment	Policy PA2.7g - Signage is good, public art maybe - but what is essential for people using the station is a crossing across that shared space.	The workings of the 'shared space' outside Victoria Railway Station will be kept under review as part of the on-going traffic monitoring of the area. No changes are proposed.
Question 21; PA2	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2407	Comment	<p>Paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 relates to energy efficiency and relates to existing development. We note that versions of this paragraph appear under other policy areas and opportunity sites, so the following comments also apply.</p> <p>Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. Special considerations under Part L are also given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within registered parks and gardens and the curtilages of scheduled monuments, and buildings of traditional construction with permeable fabric that both absorbs and readily allows the evaporation of moisture. Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should note that the application will be different in relation to these classes of buildings. Further information can be found in the Historic England advice Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings –Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historically and traditionally constructed buildings https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-pt1/. <i>This similarly applies to Policy PA1, PA2, PA3, PA4, PA5, PA7, CS1, PA8 and PA9.</i></p>	<p>This point is noted. It is therefore proposed to reference this in paragraph 85 as follows: <i>'Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.'</i></p> <p>It is proposed to add the words 'as appropriate' in paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 so that it reads, <i>'Promote energy efficiency as appropriate, including.....'</i></p> <p>This would necessitate similar changes to all other policy areas.</p>

Question 21	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2437	Comment	Victoria Gateway should be made safe by installing a pedestrian crossing across the shared space outside the Victoria Railway station.	Junction improvements are proposed at a number of key junctions in the town. The Victoria Gateway scheme provided for significant pedestrian improvements at the Victoria Avenue/Queensway junction. Its function will be kept under review as part of wider traffic management monitoring.
Question 21, PA2	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2439	Object	London Road should not be pedestrianised. The taxi rank should not be moved further away from its current position. It is already quite a distance for elderly and disabled people to walk from the shops to the taxi rank. People visiting the cinema also need the taxi nearby. At night it could cause dangerous situations if people have to walk further to the taxi rank. I would even suggest a bus route to that area, certainly not a pedestrian area. There are many banks in that area where many elderly people need to go, and for safety reasons need taxis close by for their transport requirements. Also more disabled parking to be in that area. If you pedestrianise it you take away access for disabled people to get to their Banks. If you put tables and chairs in a pedestrian area in London Road this will be a nightmare for blind and partially sighted people to walk in this area.	Policy PA2 seeks to pedestrianise London Road in the interests of improving the environment and townscape of this part of the retail area. The provision of taxi facilities enhanced pedestrian facilities and facilities for vulnerable road users will all be considered at the detailed design stage of any scheme. No changes proposed.
Question 21, PA2	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2440	Object	Throughout the document there are references to pedestrian and cycling routes. Cycling routes should be built on road space and not on pavements. At no time should pedestrians have to share with cyclists. It is too dangerous and will prevent many people who are blind and partially sighted from walking out safely. Cycling should not be allowed in the high street or any other pedestrian area.	Pedestrian and cycle routes will be provided and designed in a safe manner in accordance with best practice and guidance, having regard to the locality, road safety needs and the needs of other road users.
Question 21, PA2	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2441	Comment	The direct Link from Victoria railway station and the high street can only happen if a safe pedestrian crossing is installed across the shared space outside the station.	Junction improvements are proposed at a number of key junctions in the town. The Victoria Gateway scheme provided for significant pedestrian improvements at the Victoria Avenue/Queensway junction. Its function will be kept under review as part of wider traffic management monitoring.

Question 22, PA3	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1950	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the Elmer Square Policy Area	Noted.
Question 22, PA3	Cllr Nevin [489]	2011	Comment	Elmer Square green area ideas to tidy up and prudential building needs redeveloping, units facing the forum, hide the traders rubbish bins with trees, bushes please, we have residents living facing onto this. Picnic area on green space and children's swings or water feature	Noted, detailed design elements will be considered at the implementation stage of Elmer Square Phase 2.
Question 22, PA3	Anglian Water (Sue Ball) [37]	2019	Comment	We would recommend within each Policy Area a requirement is stipulated that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve the area before development progresses.	Refer to Rep. 2017. Reference to this has been included within section 4.12 Infrastructure Provision. As it is a statutory undertaking it is not considered necessary to repeat it in planning policy. Noted. Additional supporting is proposed to be included in 4.12 Infrastructure Provision, referencing the need for developers to make provision for the foul sewerage network.
Question 22	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2114	Comment	In relation to the middle of the High Street from Pitmans Close, Whitegate Road through to Tylers Avenue, the STOCKVALE GROUP support the extension of the education and cultural quarter into this area and would further suggest that the SCAAP looks at office use within the High Street itself and some residential uses above these offices. This would stimulate a broader economy and a safer pedestrian environment.	Noted. The SCAAP identifies a number of opportunities for achieving residential/office development within this locality. No changes are proposed.

Question 22	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2124	Support	The STOCKVALE GROUP wholly supports proposals for Elmer Square and repeats the comments that have been made in relation to the High Street. There is a greater opportunity for this segment of the High Street to have a mixture of uses as well as retail. This includes office space that directly correlates to the education hub and again a strong residential use above this segment of the High Street. The STOCKVALE GROUP recognise that the Local Authority, University and South East Essex College has already delivered significant achievements in realising the aspirations so far.	Noted. These aspects are included within the Plan (Policies DS1, PA1, PA2 and PA3).
Question 22	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2217	Comment	In relation to the middle of the High Street from Pitmans Close, Whitegate Road through to Tylers Avenue, the BID support the extension of the education and cultural quarter into this area and would further suggest that the SCAAP looks at office use within the High Street itself and some residential uses above these offices. This would stimulate a broader economy and a safer pedestrian environment.	Noted. The SCAAP identifies a number of opportunities for achieving residential/office development within this locality. No changes are proposed.
Question 22	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2227	Support	The BID wholly supports proposals for Elmer Square and repeats the comments that have been made in relation to the High Street. There is a greater opportunity for this segment of the High Street to have a mixture of uses as well as retail. This includes office space that directly correlates to the education hub and again a strong residential use above this segment of the High Street. The BID recognise that the Local Authority, University and South East Essex College has already delivered significant achievements in realising the aspirations so far.	Noted. These aspects are included within the Plan (Policies DS1, PA1, PA2 and PA3).

Question 22, PA3	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2408	Comment	<p>Paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 relates to energy efficiency and relates to existing development. We note that versions of this paragraph appear under other policy areas and opportunity sites, so the following comments also apply.</p> <p>Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. Special considerations under Part L are also given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within registered parks and gardens and the curtilages of scheduled monuments, and buildings of traditional construction with permeable fabric that both absorbs and readily allows the evaporation of moisture. Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should note that the application will be different in relation to these classes of buildings. Further information can be found in the Historic England advice Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings –Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historically and traditionally constructed buildings https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-ptl/. <i>This similarly applies to Policy PA1, PA2, PA3, PA4, PA5, PA7, CS1, PA8 and PA9.</i></p>	<p>This point is noted. It is therefore proposed to reference this in paragraph 85 as follows: <i>‘Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.’</i></p> <p>It is proposed to add the words ‘as appropriate’ in paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 so that it reads, <i>‘Promote energy efficiency as appropriate, including.....’</i></p> <p>This would necessitate similar changes to all other policy areas.</p>
Question 22, PA3	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2442	Comment	<p>The Forum is not accessible for many elderly people like it was when it was in Victoria avenue. It is not on a bus route and it is a long walk for many people to reach it from a bus stop. There should be taxi ranks and parking for disabled people next to the forum.</p>	<p>The Forum has been established at the heart of the town centre adjacent to the railway station. The provision of taxi ranks and improved connectivity for pedestrians will be considered as part of further phases of the scheme.</p>
Question 22, PA3	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2443	Comment	<p>There is mention of mixed pedestrian and cycling routes that should not be allowed on the grounds of safety as already mentioned above.</p>	<p>Pedestrian and cycle routes will be provided and designed in a safe manner in accordance with best practice and guidance, having regard to the locality, road safety needs and the needs of other road users.</p>
Queensway Policy Area – Policy PA4, Opportunity Site 4					

Question 23, PA4	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1951	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the Queensway Policy Area	Noted.
Question 23, PA4	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [37]	2020	Comment	We would recommend within each Policy Area a requirement is stipulated that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve the area before development progresses.	<p>Refer to Rep. 2017.</p> <p>Reference to this has been included within section 4.12 Infrastructure Provision. As it is a statutory undertaking it is not considered necessary to repeat it in planning policy.</p> <p>Noted. Additional supporting is proposed to be included in 4.12 Infrastructure Provision, referencing the need for developers to make provision for the foul sewerage network.</p>
Question 23	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2125	Support	Support a vastly regenerated and improved area. The STOCKVALE GROUP recognises the value in creating innovative housing typologies and a high quality built environment.	Noted.

Question 23	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2127	Comment	There are a couple of issues that the STOCKVALE GROUP want to ensure are adequately addressed through the SCAAP. The first of those is the potential of having residents parking zones, this could have a negative effect on the existing Town Centre on and off street parking and consume spaces that are vital for visitors.	Noted. Such aspects will be kept under review as part of the on-going transport monitoring of the area.
Question 23	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2128	Comment	The STOCKVALE GROUP would wish to ensure that the Queensway policy area provides connectivity into the Seaway Car Park and the opportunity to see Seaway as a Gateway to the Seafront and the first visual connection to the Sea is not lost.	Noted. These provisions are identified in Policy CS1.
Question 23	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2228	Support	Support a vastly regenerated and improved area. The BID recognises the value in creating innovative housing typologies and a high quality built environment.	Noted.
Question 23	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2230	Comment	There are a couple of issues that the BID want to ensure are adequately addressed through the SCAAP. The first of those is the potential of having residents parking zones, this could have a negative effect on the existing Town Centre on and off street parking and consume spaces that are vital for visitors.	Noted. Such aspects will be kept under review as part of the on-going transport monitoring of the area.

Question 23	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2231	Comment	STOCKVALE GROUP would wish to ensure that the Queensway policy area provides connectivity into the Seaway Car Park and the opportunity to see Seaway as a Gateway to the Seafront and the first visual connection to the Sea is not lost.	Noted. These provisions are identified in Policy CS1.
Question 23	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2254	Comment	Queensway was scored by 24% response as a top 10 priority	Noted.
Question 23, PA4	Mr Alan Grubb [59]	2299	Comment	The pedestrian accessibility at the roundabout at Porters Grange does need to be improved, one such improvement would be, to close the stairs which take the pedestrian across the roundabout and to have pedestrian controlled crossings in order the pedestrian can cross the roads in safety.	Junction improvements to improve safety, particularly pedestrian and cyclists, at Queensway/Sutton Road are included in Policy PA4. No changes are proposed.
Question 23, PA4	Mr Paul Bethell [499]	2317	Comment	OS4 – what is urban grain?	Further explanatory included in Para. 165 to define urban grain as follows ‘...to re-establish urban grain (i.e. the physical form of former and surrounding street patterns and blocks).’
Question 23, PA4	Mr Paul Bethell [499]	2318	Comment	OS4 - When I see the word "regeneration" applied in these circumstances, I think that means the council intends to demolish a lot of buildings close to me and build something which gives people better living conditions. Good for them. I presume, however, that this will be rather noisy and dirty and disruptive and inconvenience anyone living in a house just over the road for however many years it takes. So what are your plans for dealing with that? I suppose what I really want to know is: are the tower blocks going to be demolished and replaced with some affordable low-level social housing? And are there any plans to match it on Coleman Street?	The hours of construction will be controlled though conditions on any planning application permission. Affordable housing levels will be determined in line with local planning policy. The Better Queensway project will outline the detailed plans for the area, which will be assessed as part of a planning application.
Question 23, PA4	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2370	Comment	Yes, whether to demolish or refurbish the tower blocks of flats needs to be carefully considered. Keep them for another 30 years, if possible	Noted.

Question 23, PA4	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2409	Comment	<p>Paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 relates to energy efficiency and relates to existing development. We note that versions of this paragraph appear under other policy areas and opportunity sites, so the following comments also apply.</p> <p>Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. Special considerations under Part L are also given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within registered parks and gardens and the curtilages of scheduled monuments, and buildings of traditional construction with permeable fabric that both absorbs and readily allows the evaporation of moisture. Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should note that the application will be different in relation to these classes of buildings. Further information can be found in the Historic England advice Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings –Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historically and traditionally constructed buildings https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-ptl/. <i>This similarly applies to Policy PA1, PA2, PA3, PA4, PA5, PA7, CS1, PA8 and PA9.</i></p>	<p>This point is noted. It is therefore proposed to reference this in paragraph 85 as follows: <i>‘Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.’</i></p> <p>It is proposed to add the words ‘as appropriate’ in paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 so that it reads, <i>‘Promote energy efficiency as appropriate, including.....’</i></p> <p>This would necessitate similar changes to all other policy areas.</p>
Warrior Square Policy Area – Policy PA5, Opportunity Site 5					
Question 24, PA5	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1952	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the Warrior Square Policy Area and Opportunity Site	Noted.
Question 24, PA5	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	2004	Comment	Warrior Square would be enhanced by residential development on the south side to enclose and complete the square. There must be strong support for the stated principle of maintaining the quality of the square since it is the absence of any reasonable level of maintenance that led to the “improvement scheme”. There is no sign that maintenance levels have improved.	Noted, the SCAAP is not the appropriate document to set out the maintenance procedures of public spaces.
Question 24, PA5	Cllr Nevin [489]	2009	Comment	Warrior Square protecting green space in warrior square where swimming pool was, a five aside football pitch/ or multi use area, jogging track round outside. Happy with houses both sides of Whitegate, with trees please, or water feature.	Noted. This site is unlikely to be deliverable in the SCAAP timeframe and therefore will not be included in the final version of the document.

Question 24, PA5	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [37]	2021	Comment	We would recommend within each Policy Area a requirement is stipulated that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve the area before development progresses.	<p>Refer to Rep. 2017.</p> <p>Reference to this has been included within section 4.12 Infrastructure Provision. As it is a statutory undertaking it is not considered necessary to repeat it in planning policy.</p> <p>Noted. Additional supporting is proposed to be included in 4.12 Infrastructure Provision, referencing the need for developers to make provision for the foul sewerage network.</p>
Question 24	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2130	Comment	The retention of the green space is paramount and greater legibility needs to be brought through to the High Street. Clearly the previous swimming pool site is a development opportunity and the STOCKVALE GROUP would seek that that this is of the highest quality providing some activity around the ground floor to support the small pocket park of Warrior Square. The STOCKVALE GROUP recognise that this site could deliver a significant number of residential units.	<p>Noted. Opportunity Site 5 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021. Nevertheless the development principles as set out in Policy PA5, in combination with other adopted local policy and guidance, will provide the necessary framework to guide development proposals in this location.</p>
Question 24	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2131	Comment	The STOCKVALE GROUP would want to see that the existing public car park provision is retained and any residential and commercial development yield aims to meet the requirements of the Councils development management plan in regard to parking provision.	<p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>

Question 24	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2233	Comment	The retention of the green space is paramount and greater legibility needs to be brought through to the High Street. Clearly the previous swimming pool site is a development opportunity and the BID would seek that that this is of the highest quality providing some activity around the ground floor to support the small pocket park of Warrior Square. The BID recognise that this site could deliver a significant number of residential units.	<p>Noted. Opportunity Site 5 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021. Nevertheless the development principles as set out in Policy PA5, in combination with other adopted local policy and guidance, will provide the necessary framework to guide development proposals in this location</p>
Question 24	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2234	Comment	The BID would want to see that the existing public car park provision is retained and any residential and commercial development yield aims to meet the requirements of the Councils development management plan in regard to parking provision.	The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
Question 24	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2255	Comment	Warrior Square was scored by 18% as a top 10 priority.	Noted.
Question 24, PA5	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2410	Comment	<p>Paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 relates to energy efficiency and relates to existing development. We note that versions of this paragraph appear under other policy areas and opportunity sites, so the following comments also apply.</p> <p>Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. Special considerations under Part L are also given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within registered parks and gardens and the curtilages of scheduled monuments, and buildings of traditional construction with permeable fabric that both absorbs and readily allows the evaporation of moisture. Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should note that the application will be different in relation to these classes of buildings. Further information can be found in the Historic England advice Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings –Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historically and traditionally constructed buildings https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-ptl/. <i>This similarly applies to Policy PA1, PA2, PA3, PA4, PA5, PA7, CS1, PA8 and PA9.</i></p>	<p>This point is noted. It is therefore proposed to reference this in paragraph 85 as follows: <i>'Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.'</i></p> <p>It is proposed to add the words 'as appropriate' in paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 so that it reads, <i>'Promote energy efficiency as appropriate, including.....'</i></p> <p>This would necessitate similar changes to all other policy areas.</p>

Question 24, PA5	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2444	Comment	Pedestrian and cycle routes should be kept separate. No cycling should be allowed on the footway or footpath.	Pedestrian and cycle routes will be provided and designed in a safe manner in accordance with best practice and guidance, having regard to the locality, road safety needs and the needs of other road users.
Question 24, PA5	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2445	Comment	All bus routes should be kept in this area with shelters and seating provided.	The Plan seeks to improve public transport provision in the Central Area.
Question 24, PA5	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2446	Comment	This is a suitable area for a day centre for disabled people. Since the Queensway building was closed there has been nowhere for disabled people to go.	The site is considered to be most suitable for a mixed use residential led development, which could include an element of community uses. Opportunity Site 5 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period. Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021. Community infrastructure provision is promoted on the nearby Queensway site as part of the provisions of Policy PA4. No change proposed.
Question 24, PA5	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2447	Comment	There is no longer a swimming pool in the centre of the Town as the Warrior Square pool was closed. A new facility should be provided in this central area.	Policy PA5 seeks to regenerate this area with a mixed use development that respects the character and setting of the adjacent Conservation Area. The former swimming pool site is identified as having the potential to provide additional open space to mirror that of Warrior Square Gardens. A new improved swimming pool facility has been established at Garon Park outside the Plan area. No changes proposed.
Clifftown Policy Area – Policy PA6					
Question 25, PA6	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1953	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the Clifftown Policy Area	Noted.

Question 25 PA6	Cllr Nevin [489]	2013	Support	Clifftown great to see development of Empire Theatre and Alexandra Street.	Noted, specific site allocations for these areas will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there remains insufficient evidence that they will be delivered by 2021. However, this does not preclude development coming forward and this will be guided by the policy area development principles.
Question 25 PA6	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [37]	2022	Comment	We would recommend within each Policy Area a requirement is stipulated that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve the area before development progresses.	Refer to Rep. 2017. Reference to this has been included within section 4.12 Infrastructure Provision. As it is a statutory undertaking it is not considered necessary to repeat it in planning policy. Noted. Additional supporting is proposed to be included in 4.12 Infrastructure Provision, referencing the need for developers to make provision for the foul sewerage network.
Question 25	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2061	Support	Recognise the importance of the Town Centre in viability and vitality terms and the need to enhance the existing markets where appropriate and introduce and create new markets.	Noted.

Question 25	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2099	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there have been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The STOCKVALE GROUP would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions. No changes are proposed.
Question 25	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2117	Comment	<p>There could also be an improvement of pedestrian connection from the Central railway station of Southend on Sea into the Public Realm and a vast and extensive soft landscape scheme introduced around the Tylers Avenue/High Street connection to the railway station.</p>	<p>Noted. Further provision is made that seeks to improve the connectivity and public realm between Policy Area PA7 and the High Street and the Central Station, with an additional criteria to PA7 as follows: <u>'facilitates better pedestrian access to the High Street and Southend Central railway station'</u></p> <p>And the following amendment to PA6.3.b: 'streetscape and landscape design improvements, including urban greening and tree planting, to create well lit walking circuits through Clifftown from a newly created public plaza at Southend Central Railway Station/ Central House, to Cliff Gardens and Pier Hill, <u>facilitating better pedestrian access to the High Street'</u></p>

Question 25	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2132	Support	Wholly support the aspirations for the Clifftown area and recognise the value of the Clifftown conservation area. There are two development sites namely Clarence Street and Alexandra Street car parks which have been identified for redevelopment. The STOCKVALE GROUP generally support the redevelopment of these areas providing they respond to the fine grain character of the Conservation area and the scale of Alexandra Street. The STOCKVALE GROUP recognise there is an opportunity to further enhance the boutique offer of this part of Southend by means of high quality architecture and high quality retail together with A3 uses and residential uses at upper levels.	Noted. Opportunity Sites 16 and 17 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021. Comments in relation to the sites will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021. Nevertheless the development principles as set out in Policy PA6, in combination with other adopted local policy and guidance, will provide the necessary framework to guide development proposals in this location
Question 25	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2133	Comment	In relation to car parking, the STOCKVALE GROUP would seek that the existing public car parking spaces are either allocated as part of the museum provision or are included elsewhere within the south west corner of the SCAAP area. There is an opportunity with the Empire Theatre as a large basement already exists. A public car park could form part of a wholesale mixed use redevelopment of the Empire theatre.	OS9: New Southend Museum includes provision for public parking.
Question 25	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2163	Support	Recognise the importance of the Town Centre in viability and vitality terms and the need to enhance the existing markets where appropriate and introduce and create new markets	Noted.

Question 25	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2202	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there has been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The BID would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions.
Question 25	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2220	Comment	<p>There could also be an improvement of pedestrian connection from the Central railway station of Southend on Sea into the Public Realm and a vast and extensive soft landscape scheme introduced around the Tylers Avenue/High Street connection to the railway station.</p>	<p>Noted. Further provision is made that seeks to improve the connectivity and public realm between Policy Area PA7 and the High Street and the Central Station, with an additional criteria to PA7 as follows: <u>'improve pedestrian accessibility and public realm enhancement that facilitates better access to the High Street and Southend Central railway station'</u></p> <p>And the following amendment to PA6.3.b: 'streetscape and landscape design improvements, including urban greening and tree planting, to create well lit walking circuits through Clifftown from a newly created public plaza at Southend Central Railway Station/ Central House, to Cliff Gardens and Pier Hill, facilitating better pedestrian access to the High Street'</p>
Question 25	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2235	Support	<p>Wholly support the aspirations for the Clifftown area and recognise the value of the Clifftown conservation area. There are two development sites namely Clarence Street and Alexandra Street car parks which have been identified for redevelopment. The BID generally support the redevelopment of these areas providing they respond to the fine grain character of the Conservation area and the scale of Alexandra Street. The BID recognise there is an opportunity to further enhance the boutique offer of this part of Southend by means of high quality architecture and high quality retail together with A3 uses and residential uses at upper levels.</p>	<p>Noted. Opportunity Sites 16 and 17 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the sites will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021. Nevertheless the development principles as set out in Policy PA6, in combination with other adopted local policy and guidance, will provide the necessary framework to guide development proposals in this location</p>

Question 25	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2236	Comment	In relation to car parking, the BID would seek that the existing public car parking spaces are either allocated as part of the museum provision or are included elsewhere within the south west corner of the SCAAP area. There is an opportunity with the Empire Theatre as a large basement already exists. A public car park could form part of a wholesale mixed use redevelopment of the Empire theatre.	Noted. OS9: New Southend Museum will include public parking provision.
Question 25	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2256	Comment	Cliff town was scored by 18% as a top 10 priority	Noted.
Question 25; PA6	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2349	Object	Against redevelopment of Alexandra Street and Clarence Road Car Parks. Both needed for local business and for access to Royals, shops in the High Street and cafes and restaurants for short term use. People will be deterred from using the facilities if they have to go some way to park. Families, older people, those helping older/disabled people all want to set down nearby and not be banished to a multi storey.	<p>Opportunity Sites 16 and 17 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
Question 25, PA6	Procurement Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2378	Comment	The Cliff town conservation area is poorly lit and pedestrian routes for commuters from Southend Central station are seen as unsafe, where the traditional lighting is cosmetic and does not assist in the safety and security of pedestrians.	Policy DS5 seeks to ensure the provision of appropriate street lighting. Reference will be included for improved lighting in PA6.
Question 25, PA6	Procurement Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2380	Comment	Southend-On-Sea central area parking currently relies on parking in residential streets. This is especially true in the Cliff town area where the theatre and London commuters, rely on on-street parking in the residential areas surrounding. Cliff town Parade is particularly bad and has become dangerous for locals due to speed and congestion made by over parking. This causes stress and major issues for local residents. Car parks on the fringes of the city centre should be built to host and rectify these issues. Any sea front investment, regeneration or build should have a self-sustaining carpark which does not impede the local residents. A Tram system should be investigated further which would solve the train to car issue and reduce road congestion in the area; in turn reducing carbon emissions.	The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.

Question 25, PA6	Procurement Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2393	Comment	<p>All regeneration of the Clifftown conservation area should be in keeping with the surrounding residential areas in Clifftown. The whole area should come under planning consent within the Clifftown Article 4 planning policy.</p> <p>There should not be a concentration of Bars and restaurants in the area and if these are brought to the area then no such planning should be given to Wetherspoons or budget chain pubs which cause drinking issues and encourage daytime drinking lowering the tone of the area and degrading surrounding properties. Concentrating bars in one area has proven to be bad for the area and its surroundings. Union Street in Plymouth proves this. Sports pubs and night clubs should not be allowed in the Clifftown conservation area. Only quality high end pubs, restaurants and cafes should be allowed to reflect the residential area of Clifftown, thus drawing in financially solvent residents who will naturally have the capital to improve the area themselves and in turn create employment.</p>	Policy PA6 seeks to protect and enhance the character, heritage and amenities of the Clifftown Conservation Area. The provisions of Article 4 Directions are kept under review as appropriate. No changes proposed.
Question 25, PA6	Procurement Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2395	Comment	<p>Clifftown conservation area should have strict parking control as seen in the residential areas of Thorpe Bay. More double yellow lines should be introduced on all roads in Clifftown especially Clifftown Parade where parking congestion makes the road dangerous due to speeding vehicles and the narrowing of the road by parked cars. The theatre should provide parking as should the Council facilitate parking for commuters elsewhere. All official driveways should be white lined by the council to stop illegal parking and allow residents access to their own driveways. Over parking in Clifftown is a major issue, especially in Clifftown Parade. Over parking ruins what is supposed to be a conservation area, the vehicle fumes are also bad for the buildings and occupants themselves. The summer time parking restrictions do not go far enough and they should be year round. Why should we the residents have to adhere to the planning rules in Article 4 when all the extra money we spend on keeping our properties in aesthetic order is then ruined by hundreds of cars jam packed in along the streets we live in which ruin the look of the area anyway?! Clifftown Parade should have no on street parking at all.</p>	<p>Traffic management will be kept under review as part of the provisions of Policy DS5 and the Local Transport Plan. No changes proposed.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
Question 25, PA6	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2404	Comment	<p>Recommend that paragraph 2 is extended to cover proposals that are outside of a conservation area (particularly those that are adjacent to a conservation area) but offer an opportunity for enhancement of setting.</p>	This is covered by Policy DM5 of the Development Management DPD and Policy DS3 of the SCAAP.

Question 25, PA6	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2405	Comment	<p>Paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 relates to energy efficiency and relates to existing development. We note that versions of this paragraph appear under other policy areas and opportunity sites, so the following comments also apply.</p> <p>Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. Special considerations under Part L are also given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within registered parks and gardens and the curtilages of scheduled monuments, and buildings of traditional construction with permeable fabric that both absorbs and readily allows the evaporation of moisture. Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should note that the application will be different in relation to these classes of buildings. Further information can be found in the Historic England advice Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings –Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historically and traditionally constructed buildings https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-ptl/. <i>This similarly applies to Policy PA1, PA2, PA3, PA4, PA5, PA7, CS1, PA8 and PA9.</i></p>	<p>This point is noted. It is therefore proposed to reference this in paragraph 85 as follows: <i>‘Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.’</i></p> <p>It is proposed to add the words ‘as appropriate’ in paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 so that it reads, <i>‘Promote energy efficiency as appropriate, including.....’</i></p> <p>This would necessitate similar changes to all other policy areas.</p>
Question 25, PA6	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2448	Comment	<p>It is not clear about the plan for outside the Central railway Station. Taxi ranks need to be kept and bus routes need to improve in this area to encourage more people to travel to the station and High street by bus and not use their cars.</p>	<p>Policy PA6a seeks to improve the forecourt, public realm and space in front of Central Railway Station. The provision for taxis, bus stops, street furniture etc. will be taken forward at the design stage. No changes proposed.</p>
Question 25, PA6	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2449	Comment	<p>What is a public square? I do not agree with outside dining unless tables and chairs are properly guarded by a metre high barrier to prevent blind and partially sighted people walking in to them.</p>	<p>The Plan seeks to provide an improvement to soft landscaping and open space provision within the Clifftown policy area. Access arrangements to shops are considered as part of the design stage of planning applications to ensure accessibility for all users. No changes to policy are proposed.</p>
Question 25, PA6	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2450	Object	<p>Again pedestrian and cycle routes are suggested these must be kept separate. Cyclists should be on road space and not pedestrian areas.</p>	<p>Pedestrian and cycle routes will be provided and designed in a safe manner in accordance with best practice and guidance, having regard to the locality, road safety needs and the needs of other road users.</p>

Tylers Policy Area – Policy PA7, Opportunity Site 6 (OS6)

Question 26, PA7	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1954	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the Tylers Policy Area and Opportunity Site	Noted.
Question 26, PA7, OS6	Mr Harry Chandler [219]	1987	Comment	<p>OS6 - For many years I have been disappointed by the lack of a comprehensive bus station in Southend. The present arrangements in Chichester Road are unsatisfactory for both residents of Southend and surrounding area and visitors to Southend. Many people especially elderly residents, mothers with babies and small children and the disabled have to stand in cold and wet weather without adequate shelter and heating. Visitors to Southend to whom I have spoken have been appalled by current arrangements. The glazed structure south of Heygate Avenue is shunned by most bus passengers as it does not appear to be fit for purpose. To be constructive a bus station along the lines of the one in Preston, Lancashire shown below, seems the obvious solution.</p> <p>Having used this bus station for many years, is a joy to use compared with the arrangements in our town, Southend. I understand that the bus station in Preston, opened in 1969, is to be refurbished. On a smaller scale, the bus stations in Harrogate and Bath, both residential and tourist towns, also work well for passengers.</p> <p>The current location of our bus station does not seem to be ideal. The large car park adjacent to the bus station seems to work. It would seem sensible to use this large car par to build a structure similar in purpose to the one in Preston and to provide car parking and a first class bus station for the people of Southend and district and visitors as part of the Better Southend.</p>	<p>Policy PA 7 identifies the potential to relocate the existing Travel Centre (bus station) to the adjacent Tylers Avenue car park as part of a comprehensive redevelopment scheme. However, it is accepted that OS6 does not clearly state why such relocation would be appropriate. It is therefore proposed that the following wording be added to the end of point 5ii of OS6:</p> <p><i>‘...to provide for enhanced passenger transport facilities and improved pedestrian connectivity to the town centre.’</i></p>
Question 26, PA7	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	2005	Comment	Tylers policy area is a big challenge to get right and maybe the fact that the travel centre is coming down reflects that difficulty. Either way explaining to the public how so much public money was wasted is necessary as well as explaining why it will not happen again.	Noted, OS6 simply sets out the opportunity for relocation of the travel centre.

Question 26, PA7	Cllr Nevin [489]	2010	Comment	Tylers Home zoning approach design features with trees for Quebec Ave to York Rd & Heygate Ave & cul-de-sac where possible, redirecting traffic flows down York Road, to design out difficult areas.	Noted. The final design of any Home Zone scheme for these areas will be taken forward in conjunction with transport schemes. They will be able to explore the opportunities of redirection of traffic flows.
Question 26, PA7	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [37]	2023	Comment	We would recommend within each Policy Area a requirement is stipulated that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve the area before development progresses.	Refer to Rep. 2017. Reference to this has been included within section 4.12 Infrastructure Provision. As it is a statutory undertaking it is not considered necessary to repeat it in planning policy. Noted. Additional supporting is proposed to be included in 4.12 Infrastructure Provision, referencing the need for developers to make provision for the foul sewerage network.
Question 26	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2100	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there have been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The STOCKVALE GROUP would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions. No changes are proposed.

Question 26	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2115	Comment	The STOCKVALE GROUP would want to ensure that OS6 Tylers Avenue includes a replacement car park for the existing public spaces plus the parking requirements for a future development. In relation to Public Realm improvements, there is an opportunity to create a southern square as part of the Tylers Avenue proposals and link this through to the pedestrianised High Street.	<p>Noted. Adjustments to the boundary of the OS6: Tylers opportunity site will be made and will accommodate such proposals.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
Question 26	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2118	Comment	There could also be an improvement of pedestrian connection from the Central railway station of Southend on Sea into the Public Realm and a vast and extensive soft landscape scheme introduced around the Tylers Avenue/High Street connection to the railway station.	<p>Noted. Further provision is made that seeks to improve the connectivity and public realm between Policy Area PA7 and the High Street and the Central Station, with an additional criteria to PA7 as follows: <u>'improve pedestrian accessibility and public realm enhancement that facilitates better access to the High Street and Southend Central railway station'</u></p> <p>And the following amendment to PA6.3.b: 'streetscape and landscape design improvements, including urban greening and tree planting, to create well lit walking circuits through Clifftown from a newly created public plaza at Southend Central Railway Station/ Central House, to Cliff Gardens and Pier Hill, facilitating better pedestrian access to the High Street'</p>

Question 26	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2203	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there has been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The BID would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions.
Question 26	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2218	Comment	<p>The BID would want to ensure that OS6 Tylers Avenue includes a replacement car park for the existing public spaces plus the parking requirements for a future development. In relation to Public Realm improvements, there is an opportunity to create a southern square as part of the Tylers Avenue proposals and link this through to the pedestrianised High Street.</p>	<p>Noted. Adjustments to the boundary of the OS6: Tylers Opportunity Site will be made and will accommodate such proposals.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
Question 26	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2221	Comment	<p>There could also be an improvement of pedestrian connection from the Central railway station of Southend on Sea into the Public Realm and a vast and extensive soft landscape scheme introduced around the Tylers Avenue/High Street connection to the railway station.</p>	<p>Noted. Further provision is made that seeks to improve the connectivity and public realm between Policy Area PA7 and the High Street and the Central Station, with an additional criteria to PA7 as follows: <u>'improve pedestrian accessibility and public realm enhancement that facilitates better access to the High Street and Southend Central railway station'</u></p> <p>And the following amendment to PA6.3.b: 'streetscape and landscape design improvements, including urban greening and tree planting, to create well lit walking circuits through Clifftown from a newly created public plaza at Southend Central <u>Railway</u> Station/ Central House, to Cliff Gardens and Pier Hill, <u>facilitating better pedestrian access to the High Street'</u></p>

Question 26	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2257	Comment	Tylers was scored by 22% of respondents as a top 10 priority	Noted.
Question 26, PA7	Mr Alan Grubb [59]	2297	Comment	I understand that there is thought of transferring the Travel Centre to a larger site, one site might be the Tyler's Avenue car park. If so I would hope that the Council engages with the residents and the bus user in order to create a travel centre fit for purpose together with flats above the travel centre.	Policy PA7 provides for the possible relocation of the Travel Centre to Tylers Avenue car park. Further consultation will be carried out at the planning application stage, if this were considered to be a viable and feasible option. No changes are proposed.
Question 26, PA7	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2309	Support	Policy PA7 seeks to ensure stronger integration within the Central Seafront Policy Area including improved walking and cycling linkages via St John's Church and Seaway Car Park and Marine Parade Opportunity Site (OS8) and via Pier Hill. Enhancing linkages will help to increase footfall, linked trips and in turn, help to bolster the vitality and viability of the town centre and on this basis, Valad (Europe) Ltd support this policy.	Noted.
Question 26, PA7	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2411	Comment	<p>Paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 relates to energy efficiency and relates to existing development. We note that versions of this paragraph appear under other policy areas and opportunity sites, so the following comments also apply.</p> <p>Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. Special considerations under Part L are also given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within registered parks and gardens and the curtilages of scheduled monuments, and buildings of traditional construction with permeable fabric that both absorbs and readily allows the evaporation of moisture. Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should note that the application will be different in relation to these classes of buildings. Further information can be found in the Historic England advice Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings –Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historically and traditionally constructed buildings https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-ptl/. <i>This similarly applies to Policy PA1, PA2, PA3, PA4, PA5, PA7, CS1, PA8 and PA9.</i></p>	<p>This point is noted. It is therefore proposed to reference this in paragraph 85 as follows: <i>'Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.'</i></p> <p>It is proposed to add the words 'as appropriate' in paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 so that it reads, <i>'Promote energy efficiency as appropriate, including.....'</i></p> <p>This would necessitate similar changes to all other policy areas.</p>

Question 26, PA7	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2451	Comment	A new travel centre should be covered completely. It would be better located next to Victoria railway station on the old B&Q site, if not next to the Central railway station. In most towns this happens. Buses would not then hold up the traffic near to the Royals.	A central location for the bus station is considered the most appropriate to serve the needs of the town centre and central seafront area.
Question 26, PA7	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2452	Comment	What is the public square you refer to? We certainly do not want a shared space like at Victoria Gateway and City Beach. Why are railings to be removed at crossing points? This will cause danger for all pedestrians including children.	Policy identifies the potential for a new public space, as part of an overall development, in the locality of the current travel centre; should this be relocated to the Tylers Avenue car park site.
Question 26, PA7	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2453	Comment	Cycle routes must be on road space and not on footpaths or footways. Pedestrians must have uncluttered walk ways with safe pedestrian crossings at all junctions, with audible signals and tactile markings.	Pedestrian and cycle routes will be provided and designed in a safe manner in accordance with best practice and guidance, having regard to the locality, road safety needs and the needs of other road users.
Central Seafront Policy Area – Policy CS1, Opportunity Sites 7, 8, 9 and 10					
Question 27, CS1 and OS8	Mr Kenton Theobald [1930]	1930	Comment	OS8 - new cinema not needed already one up top of high street, small low rent curio/artisan shops needed instead to compliment new square at OS8 (make a Southend lanes like in Brighton), new seaway car park to recognise blue badges and give them free parking	Policy CS1 identifies the potential of the seaway car park site to provide for a mixed use development comprising leisure, cultural and tourism facilities which are considered to be appropriate in this location. The Policy allows for design and layout solutions and seeks to take advantage of the sites elevation with views of the estuary (OS8). The SCAAP is a planning policy document and does not directly cover parking charges. No changes are proposed.
Question 27, CS1	Anna Hyndnan Lahna [456]	1934	Comment	Let's hope that when the jetty is up and running, the nasty slot machine seafront will be brought upmarket with nice restaurants and shops.	Noted.
Question 27, CS1	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1955	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the Central Seafront Policy Area and sites OS7, OS8, OS9 AND CS1.1 on the proviso that there is adequate car parking provision to support the growth in footfall.	Noted. The Council has commissioned an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.

Question 27, CS1	London Southend Airport (Ms Jo Marchetti) [471]	1968	Support	LSA supports the development of new hotels, tourist attractions and would strongly encourage the development of a dedicated conference and exhibition centre. LSA has the opportunity to host and attract aviation conferences which would bring interest for the town from other countries. The centre and supporting infrastructure would need to be able to host 500+ delegates and should be positioned in the best place possible to highlight Southend's key tourist sites.	Noted. The Plan seeks to develop the new museum which provides potential provision for new conference facilities (OS 9).
Question 27, CS1, OS8	Ms Lise Hodgson [467]	1982	Object	<p>OS8 - Placing a cinema that close to the beach is a waste of valuable land. A cinema will not attract more people to the town. I do not know anyone who has ever decided to go on holiday somewhere because there is a cinema. If the Council wants another cinema in the town an area further inland would be far more appropriate.</p> <p>Once you are inside a cinema you are not going to spend a lot of money in the area. In the SCAAP the Council says they want to create an area where people want to live, but who would want to live in a place where they have to look out on a cinema instead of beautiful sea views. The Council's plans are completely devaluing our homes and destroying our enjoyment of them.</p> <p>If the Council really wanted to do the best for this area, (which I am beginning to doubt) instead of destroying it as at present, a series of restaurants and cafes with green areas in between would be more in keeping with a seaside town, perhaps with a large underground car park. That would attract people and get them to spend money in the area. Once you are inside a cinema you are not going to spend a lot of money in the area.</p>	Policy CS1 identifies the potential of the seaway car park site to provide for a mixed use development comprising leisure, cultural and tourism facilities which are considered to be appropriate in this location. The possible inclusion of a cinema is considered to be compatible with providing a mix of leisure uses to enhance the offer on this key site. The Policy also sets out design and layout principles to guide development and allow for 'urban greening', creation of new public and private green space, and seek to take advantage of the sites elevation with views of the estuary (OS8). No changes are proposed.
Question 27, CS1, OS8	Ms Lise Hodgson [467]	1983	Object	OS8 - Regarding the hotel, is there a need? Since I moved to Southend in 2006 the Royal Hotel in the High Street has been empty and is now being developed as a restaurant. If there was a need for another hotel in the area, surely someone smart would have snapped up this gem long ago.	A hotel development is considered appropriate in this location. Southend has the potential for further hotel development to promote 'longer stay' holidays (see Southend Hotel Futures Report 2010). No changes are proposed.

Question 27, CS1, OS8	Ms Lise Hodgson [467]	1984	Object	OS8 - Traffic. Have anybody from the Council ever been in this area during a summer weekend or even weekends leading up to Christmas? The area around the roundabout and Chancellor Road get completely gridlocked at least once a day and the few extra parking spaces in the developer's plan will barely fill the shortfall, let alone accommodate more traffic.	Policy CS1 provides for junction improvements at Queensway/Seaway Car Park/Chancellor Road. All major development proposals will be accompanied by a transport assessment and will have to take account of adopted parking standards. The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
Question 27, CS1	Ms Lise Hodgson [467]	1985	Object	Regarding the plans for the seafront, I am worried about all the high rise buildings being planned. If the Council are trying to create Benidorm on Sea, don't forget, we don't have the climate to make up for the dreadful buildings. The Council do not want to make the most of the natural attractions of this place, but please, please, please do not destroy it completely.	The Plan, alongside Policy DM4 of the Development Management Document, seeks to provide for appropriately sited taller and larger buildings having regard to the amenity of the area (Policy CS1). It also seeks to enhance and protect the natural attractions of the area (Policies CS2 and 3). No changes are proposed.
Question 27, CS1.10.a	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	1998	Support	Southend has been the focus of working class seaside attractions for at least 80 years and continues to be so. It is the mainstay of many seafront businesses. Those day trippers often take advantage of the sea front and the town centre facilities so improving the connectivity between the two is crucial.	Noted.
Question 27, CS1	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	2006	Comment	Central seafront policy area principles contain reference to the “use of high quality coordinated materials, durable and easy to maintain”. May I suggest that such a requirement be applied to all policy areas where appropriate. There is no reason why the seafront should be singled out for exceptional treatment.	Noted, reference to the ‘ <i>use of high quality coordinated materials, durable and easy to maintain</i> ’ will be removed from CS1, as this is covered by Streetscape Manual Supplementary Planning Guidance.
Question 27, CS1	Cllr Nevin [489]	2014	Support	Seaway Like cycle paths, would be happy to have more green area here, as natural viewing point towards seafront and Spanish steps	Noted.
Question 27, CS1	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [37]	2024	Comment	We would recommend within each Policy Area a requirement is stipulated that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve the area before development progresses.	Refer to Rep. 2017. Reference to this has been included within section 4.12 Infrastructure Provision. As it is a statutory undertaking it is not considered necessary to repeat it in planning policy. Noted. Additional supporting is proposed to be included in 4.12 Infrastructure Provision, referencing the need for developers to make provision for the foul sewerage network.

Question 27, CS1, OS8	Mr Michael Davies [493]	2034	Support	OS8 - As a long-time resident of the Southend area (since 1959), I have the following comments to make about the proposed development. This area obviously needs development, as it has become progressively more and more run down over the past few years. The council is right to develop the area, and understandably, local business people are excited about the prospect. The SCAAP plan is bold and ambitious.	Noted.
--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------	----------------	--	---------------

Question 27, CS1, OS8	Mr Michael Davies [493]	2035	<p>Comment</p> <p>In para 192, it mentions a proposed large development area known as Marine Plaza", and that "The site offers potential for taller and larger buildings" However, I feel that this proposed development requires carefully consideration as regards its impact on the local area. Has the Council considered the following aspects?</p> <p>The Kursaal is a historic landmark in a historic seaside town. A tall, multi-storey buildingg right next to it will completely overshadow it, and in my view, look totally out of place. I believe that any building plan should take the current building style into account. In my view, the proposed development may well not do that. If this proposal goes ahead, it will probably not be sympathetic with the existing architecture, and character of the area.</p> <p>I realise that the developers need to make a reasonable profit from their endeavours, and building upwards is always a good way of achieving that end. However, the people of Southend will be the ones that have to live with the result, not the developers, who may not live in the area, and therefore it may not be too much of a consideration for them. A local example of a development that does not fit into the local scene can be found not far away, along the Cliff tops near the Cliffs Pavilion in Westcliff. There are two high rise buildings along there. One is Westward Ho, which has 10/11 storeys (depending on whether you count the ground floor). A little further along is Tower Court, rising 16 storeys into the sky. What a couple of eyesores they are! In my view they should never have been given planning permission. These two buildings look totally and completely out of place. But, now, of course, it's too late. They will remain there, in all their 'glory', and outlive us all. Once mistakes like that have been made, that's it. End of story. <i>There's</i> no going back. Demolition, (although desirable!), is not a realistic option now.</p> <p>In my view, they are on a par with what's now being proposed for the Seaway area. Two nearby cliff top buildings, Stratton House (7 storeys?) and Heathfield House (5 storeys?), are about the same height as the historic Westcliff Hotel (5 Storeys), and the former Overcliff Hotel (long since demolished), and so, don't look too out of place. In my view, a similar approach should be taken with the proposed Seaway development. Another example is- in the 1960s, a long string of tall, square office blocks were thrown up along Victoria Avenue. They now look like shabby eyesores. They served their purpose at the time, of course, but I hope that Southend Council will consider these examples, and bear the future in mind.</p>	<p>It should be noted that Marine Plaza now has planning permission (July 2015) for a residential led mixed-use development and will be allocated within the SCAAP.</p> <p>The Grade II listed Kursaal is recognised as a Landmark Building (Policy DS3) within the SCAAP and any new development proposals within the area will be expected to demonstrate that it is compatible with and/ or enhances key views of the building (Policy DS2). Furthermore, Policy DM5 of the Development Management Document provides detailed policy regarding the historic environment, recognising the significance of heritage assets.</p>
-----------------------	-------------------------	------	--	--

Question 27, CS1, OS8	Mr Michael Davies [493]	2038	Comment	If the whole of the Seaway car park is built on, where will people who now park there to shop in Southend High Street and the Royals, and use the seafront facilities, park? The Royals car park and the ones at the back of Marks and Spencer already get filled up. If Seaway car park disappears, or is severely reduced in size, those two car parks will have even more strain put upon them, much to the frustration of local shoppers and visitors to the town, some of whom may well decide it's just not worth the bother, and head out to Basildon, or other seaside resorts. I note that local traders are also now expressing concerns about parking, as reported on the front page of the Yellow Advertiser of Friday 29 January 2016.	Noted. OS 8 makes provision for car parking in any development scheme. The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
Question 27	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2083	Support	Supports the enhancement and quality of the Green and Open spaces along the Central Seafront and the protection of Southend's unique heritage including the nationally important Grade II Listed Southend Pier.	Noted.
Question 27	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2469	Support	Support enhancement of the Pier as national icon and a significant regeneration and enhancement of this key tourist attraction, which at present underperforms both in terms of its attraction and in terms of its visitor experience.	Noted

Question 27	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2089	Support	Support a higher intensification of residential uses in the Central Area together with a broader mix of commercial uses ranging from A1 retail, A3 restaurant café, D2 leisure and B1 offices to provide a more diverse multi-use High Street and Central Seafront.	Noted.
-------------	---	------	---------	---	--------

Question 27	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2093	Comment	<p>Some members of the STOCKVALE GROUP and representatives of the Seafront businesses believe that one way in which the congestion into the Town could be improved is for an additional 3840 parking spaces to be made accessible and available within close proximity to the Seafront and core High Street Area. This is due to the day visitor attraction industry, particularly family attractions such as the Seafront receiving the vast majority of its income in a few weeks of the year. These generally coincide with the school holidays. During this peak period a visitor attraction business needs to be able to accommodate every visitor that wants to visit as these peak days effectively subsidise the operation for the rest of the year.</p> <p>If the access to the main attractions is limited on peak days by the availability of car parking spaces, this could and does have serious impact on the viability of the Seafront businesses. The main parking areas are generally at capacity on peak holiday periods. Any loss of capacity as a result of the SCAAP proposals would result in a cap of visitors during these peak periods. This limits the amount of investment within the Seafront to the current status quo.</p> <p>Transport and access is not just limited to the Seafront and does have a huge impact on the High Street, combined with parking tariffs, access and egress, and poor legibility around the Town Centre. Whilst the changes outlined in the SCAAP from a space and use perspective will do an awful lot to reinvigorate and regenerate the High Street, this must be inclusive of a renewed and fresh approach to parking provision within the SCAAP Area.</p>	<p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
-------------	---	------	---------	--	---

Question 27	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2101	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there have been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The STOCKVALE GROUP would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions. No changes are proposed.
Question 27	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2103	Support	<p>The STOCKVALE GROUP note the townscape improvements and guidance on design quality and Heritage preservation and enhancement are inextricably linked to improvements to Public Realm and pedestrian connectivity. The STOCKVALE GROUP like the majority of the Town support the continued regeneration and reinvention of the Towns greatest icon Southend's Pleasure Pier. As there are a number of opportunity sites outlined in the SCAAP document, the STOCKVALE GROUP would suggest that the Council (through the SCAAP document) develop design codes and development briefs to ensure that the townscape improvements and quality of design of future developments meet the aspirational high standard to create a coherent and consistent Central Area. This needs to reflect on the Towns Heritage and look towards the future to create Southend as unique place and destination for leisure, shopping, living and working.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this and will be updated to identify a number of proposal sites that could be subject to a masterplanning approach.

Question 27, OS8	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2106	Comment	There is concern that proposals for the Seaway Car Park (OS8) are missing the opportunity to see this as a key gateway site for both the Town and Seafront and an opportunity to provide a greatly enhanced Public Car Park provision as part of the overall site redevelopment.	OS8 recognises that this is a key gateway site and opportunities exist to improve connectivity with the central seafront area. Provisions are included within OS8 to achieve this. The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
Question 27, OS9	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2107	Support	In relation to OS9 the STOCKVALE GROUP wholly support the Museum but would seek the inclusion of a public car park which would appear to be feasible as the construction method for creating the Museum would involve extensive ground work, which could utilise the lower levels for a covered car park.	OS9 makes provision for public car parking (Policy CS1). No changes are proposed.

Question 27	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2120	Support	The STOCKVALE GROUP support the Public Realm improvements and further connectivity down through and into the Seafront. The STOCKVALE GROUP recognise that Pier Hill has had a huge success in this regard.	Noted.
Question 27, OS8	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2121	Comment	There is a greater opportunity to look at the Seaway site as a Gateway both connecting the High Street around St Johns through Lucy Road and down onto the Seafront. This is a fantastic opportunity that could yield both greatly improved Public Realm, High Street offer and experience and a significant number of residential units.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this (Policy CS1).

Question 27	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2129	Comment	The STOCKVALE GROUP would wish to ensure that the Queensway policy area provides connectivity into the Seaway Car Park and the opportunity to see Seaway as a Gateway to the Seafront and the first visual connection to the Sea is not lost.	Noted. These provisions are identified in Policy CS1.
Question 27	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2135	Comment	<p>Due to the topography of the Seaway Car Park there is an opportunity to cut into the site and create a formal entrance that can create a visual gateway as part of the access route. There is an opportunity to accommodate somewhere in the region of 1500 parking spaces arranged over 2-3-4 floors. Traffic movements would then come in directly at the northern edge of the site and filter through into the layered car park.</p> <p>To the south side Lucy Road could then be completely pedestrianised and a punch through to the seafront creating a large piazza activated by new A1, A3 uses to compliment both the Central Seafront and the links into the High Street. The pedestrian link would then improve the environs around St John's church. To drive some additional value it is perfectly legitimate to consider a number of floors of residential uses above the car park and retail/A3 commercial offer.</p>	<p>Noted, Some of these aspects are included in Policy CS1.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2185	Support	Supports the enhancement and quality of the Green and Open spaces along the Central Seafront and the protection of Southend's unique heritage including the nationally important Grade II Listed Southend Pier.	Noted.
Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2186	Support	Support enhancement of the Pier as national icon and a significant regeneration and enhancement of this key tourist attraction, which at present underperforms both in terms of its attraction and in terms of its visitor experience.	Noted.

Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2192	Support	Support a higher intensification of residential uses in the Central Area together with a broader mix of commercial uses ranging from A1 retail, A3 restaurant café, D2 leisure and B1 offices to provide a more diverse multi-use High Street and Central Seafront.	Noted.
Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2196	Comment	<p>Some members of the BID and representatives of the Seafront businesses believe that one way in which the congestion into the Town could be improved is for an additional 3840 parking spaces to be made accessible and available within close proximity to the Seafront and core High Street Area. This is due to the day visitor attraction industry, particularly family attractions such as the Seafront receiving the vast majority of its income in a few weeks of the year. These generally coincide with the school holidays. During this peak period a visitor attraction business needs to be able to accommodate every visitor that wants to visit as these peak days effectively subsidise the operation for the rest of the year.</p> <p>If the access to the main attractions is limited on peak days by the availability of car parking spaces, this could and does have serious impact on the viability of the Seafront businesses. The main parking areas are generally at capacity on peak holiday periods. Any loss of capacity as a result of the SCAAP proposals would result in a cap of visitors during these peak periods. This the amount of investment within the Seafront to the current status quo. Transport and access is not just limited to the Seafront and does have a huge impact on the High Street, combined with parking tariffs, access and egress, and poor legibility around the Town Centre. Whilst the changes outlined in the SCAAP from a space and use perspective will do an awful lot to reinvigorate and regenerate the High Street, this must be inclusive of a renewed and fresh approach to parking provision within the SCAAP Area.</p>	The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.

Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2204	Comment	<p>Various improvements have been made to the Central Seafront including improved connectivity through Pier Hill and the City Beach. Whilst there has been some improvements to the landscape of the High Street, this needs a much greater consideration and linking to new development. There needs to be greater inclusion of soft landscaping and public spaces and improved connections from the High Street through to the Seafront. This is particularly the case with Seaway Development. This development site represents a great opportunity to create a gateway development and pedestrian links and improved Public Realm linked to the Seafront.</p> <p>The BID would wish to see a breaking down of the linearity of the High Street and the creation of a number of destination and unique quarters. This resonates particularly through with the Tylers Avenue, London Road and Alexandra and Clarence Street opportunity sites.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve these aspects through its policy provisions.
Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2206	Support	<p>The BID townscape improvements and guidance on design quality and Heritage preservation and enhancement are inextricably linked to improvements to Public Realm and pedestrian connectivity. The BID like the majority of the Town support the continued regeneration and reinvention of the Towns greatest icon Southend's Pleasure Pier. As there are a number of opportunity sites outlined in the SCAAP document, the BID would suggest that the Council (through the SCAAP document) develop design codes and development briefs to ensure that the townscape improvements and quality of design of future developments meet the aspirational high standard to create a coherent and consistent Central Area. This need to reflect on the Towns Heritage and look towards the future to create Southend as unique place and destination for leisure, shopping, living and working.</p>	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this and will be updated to identify a number of proposal sites that could be subject to a masterplanning approach.
Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2209	Comment	<p>There is concern that proposals for the Seaway Car Park (OS8) are missing the opportunity to see this as a key gateway site for both the Town and Seafront and an opportunity to provide a greatly enhanced Public Car Park provision as part of the overall site redevelopment.</p>	<p>OS8 recognises that this is a key gateway site and opportunities exist to improve connectivity with the central seafront area. Provisions are included within OS8 to achieve this.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>

Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2210	Support	In relation to OS9 the STOCKVALE GROUP wholly support the Museum but would seek the inclusion of a public car park which would appear to be feasible as the construction method for creating the Museum would involve extensive ground work, which could utilise the lower levels for a covered car park.	OS9 makes provision for public car parking. No changes are proposed.
Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2223	Support	The BID support the Public Realm improvements and further connectivity down through and into the Seafront. The BID recognise that Pier Hill has had a huge success in this regard.	Noted
Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2224	Comment	There is a greater opportunity to look at the Seaway site as a Gateway both connecting the High Street around St Johns through Lucy Road and down onto the Seafront. This is a fantastic opportunity that could yield both greatly improved Public Realm, High Street offer and experience and a significant number of residential units.	Noted. The Plan seeks to achieve this (Policy CS1).
Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2232	Comment	STOCKVALE GROUP would wish to ensure that the Queensway policy area provides connectivity into the Seaway Car Park and the opportunity to see Seaway as a Gateway to the Seafront and the first visual connection to the Sea is not lost .	Noted. These provisions are identified in Policy CS1.
Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2252	Comment	68% of recipients scored the Seafront as a top 10 priority.	Noted.
Question 27	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2260	Comment	Due to the topography of the Seaway Car Park there is an opportunity to cut into the site and create a formal entrance that can create a visual gateway as part of the access route. There is an opportunity to accommodate somewhere in the region of 1500 parking spaces arranged over 2-3-4 floors. Traffic movements would then come in directly at the northern edge of the site and filter through into the layered car park. To the south side Lucy Road could then be completely pedestrianised and a punch through to the seafront creating a large piazza activated by new A1, A3 uses to compliment both the Central Seafront and the links into the High Street. The pedestrian link would then improve the environs around St John's church. To drive some additional value it is perfectly legitimate to consider a number of floors of residential uses above the car park and retail/A3 commercial offer.	Noted. These aspects are included in Policy CS1.

Question 27, CS1	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2281	Comment	Put 'The Golden Mile' under a high-level cover to provide for inclement weather	Policy CS1 seeks to achieve a whole range of environmental and related improvements to the 'Golden Mile'. It will be an issue of practicability and viability when or whether development proposals come forward. No changes are proposed.
Question 27, CS1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2310	Comment	Valad (Europe) Ltd are concerned about the proposal to produce a development brief in relation to Seaway Car Park and Marine Parade. There is sufficient opportunity to provide an appropriate level of detail in Policy CS1 and avoid the potential delay and uncertainty that may arise if a development brief is now progressed. The submission of an application for its redevelopment should not be delayed a result of a failure to produce a development brief	As Policy CS1 sets out a number of design and layout solutions, and any major development of OS8 will be the subject of detailed consultation, reference to a development brief is to be removed.
Question 27, CS1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2311	Support	Valad (Europe) support the proposed allocation of Opportunity Site 8 on the basis that it proposes a mixed use development that will help to bolster the town centre economy. The indicative phasing for the redevelopment of Opportunity Area 8 is supported but the Council must actively resist developments that would undermine this policy and what it seeks to achieve for the town centre.	Noted.
Question 27, CS1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2312	Comment	Further wording should be provided which states that the redevelopment of the Central Seafront Policy Area will be key to the success of the Southend Central Area Action Plan and that in turn, it will help to improve the vitality and viability of the town centre and sustain existing facilities in the town centre such as The Royals by increasing footfall and linked trips within the town centre.	There is considered to be merit in bringing greater attention to the role of the central seafront area. It is therefore proposed that paragraph 184 (page 111) be amended to read as follows: <u>'The Central Seafront Policy Area, as defined on the Policies Map, is a thriving leisure and tourism area. Although there has always been a physical separation of the Central Seafront Policy Area and Town Centre, if access was more straightforward and more pronounced there may be a better exchange of visitors between the Central Seafront and Town Centre and their functions.'</u>

Question 27, CS1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2313	Comment	The Council should consider whether the inclusion of retail at Opportunity Site 8 would bring further benefits to the town centre. The success of this development and the subsequent beneficial spin off effects will largely be down to how well the site links in with the town centre.	OS8 is a key development site in the central seafront area. The uses identified in the Plan are considered to be the most appropriate given its location adjacent to tourism and leisure facilities. No changes are proposed.
Question 27, CS1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2314	Comment	The provision of appropriate signage to increase and enhance connectivity between the High Street and the seafront should also be included in the design criteria for both the Policy Area and Opportunity Site 8.	It is recognised that quality signage is essential in the central area. It is therefore proposed that the words ‘improve and’ are added to Policy CS1 10e so that it would read: ‘remove unnecessary street furniture and <u>improve and</u> rationalise signage in accordance with.....’ In OS8 add: ‘h. the provision of appropriate <u>seating</u>, signage and way finding.’
Question 27, CS1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Royals Shopping Centre (Helen McManus) [498]	2315	Comment	There is a real concern that if the revised proposals (yet to be submitted to the Council) for Fossetts Farm are approved, then town centre developments such as that at Seaway Car Park and further town centre investment generally will not go ahead to the detriment of the town centre.	The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundaries. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study). Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy and require a further retail impact assessment. No changes are proposed.
Question 27, CS1.13.2	Carter Jonas on behalf of Turnstone Southend Ltd (Mr Matt Hare) [503]	2325	Support	Policy CS1.13.2 - Broadly support the proposed policy approach for OS8, but we do suggest some minor changes to the policy wording to Section 13ii in Policy CS1 to ensure the delivery of the development. The proposed development would make more efficient use of previously developed land within the town centre	Noted

Question 27, CS1.13.2	Carter Jonas on behalf of Turnstone Southend Ltd (Mr Matt Hare) [503]	2326	Comment	<p>Policy CS1.13.2 - Delete the requirement for a development brief to be prepared for the site. A planning application is currently being prepared for the Seaway Car Park site. Section 13ii of Policy CS1 already provides sufficient detail to guide the proposed development on the site. The land required to deliver the proposed development at the Seaway Car Park site is controlled by a single developer. A development brief would add unnecessary delay and cost to the proposed development.</p> <p>Suggested Change: This should be taken forward through the preparation of a development brief. Design and layout solutions should allow for:</p>	Reference to the development brief will be removed as it is considered that there is sufficient detailed contained in the OS8 of CS1 and further detailed will be provided at the design stage as part of the planning proposal and be subject to consultation.
Question 27, CS1.13.2	Carter Jonas on behalf of Turnstone Southend Ltd (Mr Matt Hare) [503]	2327	Comment	<p>Policy CS1.13.2 It should be clearly stated that residential development should be located on the Marine Parade site. Planning permission has already been granted for residential development on the Marine Parade site; referred to as Marine Plaza. Residential uses are not proposed within the current scheme on the Seaway Car Park site. It is not clear whether residential uses would be compatible with the proposed leisure uses, and further investigation would be required if residential uses were proposed.</p> <p>Suggested Change:</p> <p>We request the following changes to Section 13ii of Policy CS1:</p> <p>ii Opportunity Site 8: Seaway Car Park and Marine Parade, the Council will pursue with private sector partners, landowners and developers a high quality, mixed use development including the provision of leisure, cultural and tourism attractions including: restaurants, cinema, gallery, hotel, residential development, public and private open spaces, and car parking. The Marine Parade site would provide most of the residential development for the opportunity site.</p>	<p>The final version of the SCAAP will separate OS8 into Seaway Car Park and Marine Parade, with the latter benefitting from an approved planning permission.</p> <p>It is considered that Seaways may be able to provide some residential development and reference to this is considered appropriate to apply flexibility to the policy. The policy wording has been changed to allow for this to be explored. Policy OS8.13.2 will read: <u>'...including the provision of leisure, cultural and tourism attractions including: restaurants, cinema, gallery, hotel, public and private open spaces, and vehicle and cycle parking. The potential for residential development may also be explored. Design and layout solutions should allow for:'</u></p>
Question 27, CS1.13.2	Carter Jonas on behalf of Turnstone Southend Ltd (Mr Matt Hare) [503]	2328	Comment	<p>Policy CS1.13.2 There is a requirement for allocated sites to be deliverable and viable, and as such all parts of a policy should meet those requirements. The delivery of a new link from the Seaway Car Park site to Marine Parade is uncertain, and this should be expressed in the policy.</p> <p>Suggested Change:</p> <p>c. explore opportunities for a new link to Marine Parade from the Seaway site designed around 'Spanish Steps' subject to deliverability and viability;</p>	This part of policy seeks to identify possible innovative design solutions to improving connectivity across this key site between the town centre and seafront and seeks to 'explore opportunities.' Including the words 'subject to deliverability and viability' is considered inappropriate. These matters would be considered as part of the planning application process. No changes proposed.

Question 27, CS1.13.2	Carter Jonas on behalf of Turnstone Southend Ltd (Mr Matt Hare) [503]	2329	Comment	<p>Policy CS1.13.2 It is not clear at this stage where the coach drop-off point would be relocated to, and it could be on or off site or a combination of both, and as such this uncertainty should be expressed in the policy.</p> <p>Suggested Change</p> <p>e. relocation of the coach-drop off point, either on or off-site or a combination of both, following the development of the Seaway site.</p>	<p>The wording of Policy CS1 will be amended to state that relocation of the coach drop off point should be provided on the Seaways site. Coach parking bays may be provided either on or off-site or a combination of both, as long as offsite provision is well connected to the Seaways site and would not significantly adversely impact the local transport network. Policy OS8 13.2 will be amended as follows: <u>‘relocation of a coach-drop off point within the site. The relocation of coach parking bays may be provided either on or off-site or a combination of both, provided offsite provision is well connected to the Seaways site and would not significantly adversely impact the local transport network;’</u></p>
Question 27, CS1.10g	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2350	Object	<p>Policy CS1.10g - Against proposal 10g to further develop City Beach. Comments have been made about flooding, accidents, risks to pedestrians in non-stopping traffic and no marked and lighted official crossing with blister paving put down where there is no crossing risking the lives of blind people.</p> <p>City Beach - Kerbs are not only a safety zone for pedestrians but help to direct rain water to drains which should be adequate.</p> <p>The seafront shared space is dangerous, has no formal crossings and various accidents have occurred. A proper crossing should be in place and not further extension of any shared space.</p>	<p>The extension of the City Beach scheme is considered to be essential to regenerating the central seafront area and to improving the leisure and tourism offer and environment. Issues such as flooding, road safety and provision for vulnerable road users will need to form an integral part of the design stage of the scheme. No changes proposed.</p> <p>Reference to flood mitigation measures will be included in Policy CS1.</p> <p>Reference to managing the road network safely will be incorporated into Policy DS5.a</p>
Question 27, CS1.12.ii.c	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2351	Object	<p>Policy CS1.12.ii.c - The 'Spanish Steps' are a thoroughly dangerous idea for all users and will have to go through property(ies). This should not be pursued.</p>	<p>This is a key gateway site in the town. This part of policy seeks to identify possible innovative design solutions to improving connectivity across this key site between the town centre and seafront and seeks to ‘explore opportunities’. It is essential that the design and layout of the site is of the highest quality that enhances the area and takes full advantage of its location and setting. The needs of vulnerable road users will be taken into account at this design stage. No changes are proposed.</p>
Question 27, CS1.12.iii	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2352	Object	<p>Policy CS1.12.iii - The Museum is in the wrong place not in tune with the leisure area. If just to shore up the cliffs it should be a leisure building. We do not have the like of the Mary Rose in the town and the thought that people coming down for the day to the beach, pier or lagoon will spend time in a museum is not considered to be sensible.</p>	<p>The museum is one of a number of cultural and leisure uses proposed to be incorporated within the new building. No changes proposed. It is considered that a museum is complimentary to other leisure uses and will provide a valued destination.</p>

Question 27, CS1 & OS8	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2371	Comment	(191) Seaways car park and Marine Parade. We do not believe another cinema is sustainable in Southend	Policy CS1 identifies the potential of the seaway car park site to provide for a mixed use development comprising leisure, cultural and tourism facilities which are considered to be appropriate in this location. The possible inclusion of a cinema is considered to be compatible with providing a mix of leisure uses to enhance the offer on this key site. The Policy also proposes design and layout solutions, for 'urban greening' and seeks to take advantage of the sites elevation with views of the estuary (OS8). No changes are proposed.
Question 27, CS1 & OS9	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2372	Comment	(193) We believe that the Saxon King find should be housed in Prittlewell. It is not appropriate to have this displayed on our seaside tourist area.	The museum is one of a number of cultural and leisure uses proposed to be incorporated within the new building on the seafront, which is considered to be the best location for such a scheme where visitor numbers are at their greatest. No changes proposed.
Question 27, CS1	Southend and District Pensioners Campaign (Mr Robert Howes) [476]	2373	Comment	Yes agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the central seafront policy area apart from the above	Noted.

Question 27, CS1 & OS9	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2383	Support	<p>OS9 - Southend-On-Sea museum position on the seafront below Clifftown parade is a good idea in principle but the residents of Clifftown will not allow access to be gained from Clifftown parade and all access to development whether it be by bus coach or car should be via the sea front road and not Clifftown parade, which is a residential road. The Museum should be reduced in height from its current plan to ensure it steps down from the cliff and not in line with the cliff. This drop down would stop the extension that juts out impeding on the Clifftown area, local views and the Victorian design of the area. Any brickwork used in the build should be of high quality and fit with the old red brick of the backdrop houses on the clifftop. The band stand and shelters should be incorporated in to the design of the museum to gently mix new with old and celebrate the heritage as the museum should not only exhibit artefacts and images but the local architecture of the seaside town too. Should the conservation area be extended this would assist in making the whole seafront and town in to a living museum but with a modern function. Remember shabby Chic is the new modern!! If the museum is built then all parking for the museum should be provided by the museum in underground parking (including coaches) and access should be from the seafront and no access at all from Clifftown Parade. This is a residential area and should be protected as such.</p>	<p>The detailed design and layout of any new development at this location will be considered and consulted upon during the planning application process.</p> <p>Policy CS1.13.3 outlines that the design of new development will need to retain the 'open feel' of the area. Policy DM1 of the Development Management Document and the Design and Townscape Guide provides additional design related guidance. In addition the conservation area will be a material consideration. It is recognised that the policy can be further enhanced by outlining that vehicular access of a new development in this location should be via Western Esplanade. Therefore, the following wording is proposed to be added to the policy 13.iii</p> <p><i>'Vehicular access should ensure that the primary road network, i.e. via Western Esplanade, is used to access the development and any new parking facilities.'</i></p>
Question 27, CS1 & OS7	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2390	Comment	<p>OS7 - The Council should actively seek investment for the pier and include such things as a proper boat marina for Southend, 24 hour access to the pier, ferry access to the pier, quality restaurants and cafes. Why not move the museum to the end of the pier, have yacht club facilities and a purpose built sheltered marina at the end of the pier?</p>	<p>Policy CS1 seeks to provide for a mix of cultural and leisure uses. Any development would need to have regard to the environmental designation on the foreshore. No changes proposed.</p>

Question 27, CS1	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2412	Comment	<p>Paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 relates to energy efficiency and relates to existing development. We note that versions of this paragraph appear under other policy areas and opportunity sites, so the following comments also apply.</p> <p>Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. Special considerations under Part L are also given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within registered parks and gardens and the curtilages of scheduled monuments, and buildings of traditional construction with permeable fabric that both absorbs and readily allows the evaporation of moisture. Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should note that the application will be different in relation to these classes of buildings. Further information can be found in the Historic England advice Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings –Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historically and traditionally constructed buildings https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-ptl/. <i>This similarly applies to Policy PA1, PA2, PA3, PA4, PA5, PA7, CS1, PA8 and PA9.</i></p>	<p>This point is noted. It is therefore proposed to reference this in paragraph 85 as follows: <i>‘Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.’</i></p> <p>It is proposed to add the words ‘as appropriate’ in paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 so that it reads, <i>‘Promote energy efficiency as appropriate, including.....’</i></p> <p>This would necessitate similar changes to all other policy areas.</p>
Question 27, CS1	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2415	Comment	<p><i>In the aims of the Central Seafront Policy Area</i> we would suggest a small word order change as it currently reads as if the Pier is not an iconic landmark, but will be rejuvenated into one, instead of being the iconic landmark that it is which you are proposing will be rejuvenated.</p>	<p>Agreed. It is therefore proposed to amend the first paragraph of the Aims of the Central Seafront Policy Area so that it reads, <i>‘The Central Seafront will be a thriving and vibrant leisure, cultural and tourism area centred on the <u>iconic</u> Grade II listed Pier which will be rejuvenated as a <u>key</u> local landmark and attraction.’</i></p>
Question 27, CS1, Para 184	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2416	Comment	<p>Recommend that paragraph 184 in the supporting text includes conservation areas and listed buildings as specific ‘environmental designations’ as this links through to paragraph1 of Policy CS1 which talks about the impact of proposals on ‘environmental designations’.</p>	<p>Environmental designations cover SSSI, SPA and Ramsar sites. The term is not meant to cover heritage assets, which are covered by Policy CS1.4. However, it is proposed to include reference to conservation areas and listed buildings in paragraph 185 as follows: <i>‘There is a need to strike a balance between the protection and conservation of natural and built assets, including Conservation Areas and listed buildings, with the needs of residents and visitors’</i></p>
Question 27, CS1.8	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2417	Support	<p>We welcome paragraph 4 of Policy CS1</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Question 27, CS1	Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [334]	2423	Support	We are very supportive of this policy. Point 5, in particular, is very positive, as it recognises the opportunity that new development provides for integrating tidal defences into the public realm.	Noted.
Question 27, CS1	Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [334]	2424	Comment	Point 7 could potentially be strengthened by allowing development south of the sea wall only by exception and where the proposed land use is deemed to be 'water compatible' as defined in the Planning Practice Guidance.	Noted, therefore the following amendment is proposed: <i>'Not normally permit development south of the seawall. Any proposed use will also have to be water compatible as defined in the Planning Practice Guidance.'</i>
Question 27, CS1	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2454	Comment	Up to 1970 we had a direct bus route from Southend Victoria Railway station down the High street, down Pier Hill to and along the sea front. Unfortunately engineers of the day ignored our access committee and went along with their plans of pedestrianising the high street and cutting off the sea front from the high street restricting hundreds of people getting to the shops by bus.	Policy, as part of the sustainable approach to transport, seeks to improve the provision for public transport users and provides for bus priority measures. Specific bus routes are considered as part of on-going partnership working with bus operators.
Question 27, CS1	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2455	Comment	OS8 - Spanish steps will certainly stop many disabled people from getting to the sea front. Spanish steps are not accessible and should not be used.	The provision of 'spanish steps' is part of an innovative design approach to the site. The needs of vulnerable users to access and cross the site will also be taken into account at the design stage of any scheme.
Question 27, CS1	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2456	Comment	The City Beach scheme was built without proper consultation and did not take into account the needs of disabled people. The Courtesy crossings are not legal crossings and cannot be used safely by blind people. The whole area should be reinstated to a proper road with kerbs and proper pedestrian crossings, with audible signals and tactile markings. The City Beach scheme should not be extended.	Further phases of the City Beach scheme will consider the needs of all users and be subject to public consultation.
Question 27, CS1	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2457	Comment	A bus service should be established from the Kursaal to Chalkwell along the sea front.	Policy, as part of the sustainable approach to transport, seeks to improve the provision for public transport users and provides for bus priority measures. Specific bus routes are considered as part of on-going partnership working with bus operators.

Question 27, CS1	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2458	Comment	OS9 - The proposed new Museum will not be able to be visited by non car drivers if you do not have a bus service, which is discrimination.	Policy, as part of the sustainable approach to transport, seeks to improve the provision for public transport users and provides for bus priority measures. Specific bus routes are considered as part of on-going partnership working with bus operators.
Question 27, CS1	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2459	Comment	Currently there is no cycle route at City Beach and cycles ride illegally on the foot path. A cycle route should be built the whole length of the sea front on the road and not on the footway. The cyclists should stop at pedestrian crossings.	This area has been established as a shared walking and cycling route. Cycle provision forms part of the shared space in the central seafront area.
Question 27, CS1	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2460	Comment	There should be more public toilets, none are listed.	Noted. Toilets and related facilities will be considered at the design stage of any redevelopment scheme and through on-going review of current provision.

Question 27, CS1	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2461	Comment	In the central seafront policy area there should also be parking for disabled people at frequent intervals.	<p>Site occupiers with reference to national parking guidance and legislation are responsible for providing an adequate number of spaces for people with disabilities.</p> <p>The SCAAP seeks to promote a positive approach to public car parking provision that provides public car parking levels that support the vitality of the town centre and access to the seafront by encouraging improvements to the quality of access to parking so that it is convenient, well-signposted, safe and secure.</p> <p>It is considered that reference to a range of parking types, including for disabled people, should be made within Policy DS5.</p>
------------------	---	------	---------	---	---

Question 28, Policy CS2	Natural England (Mr Gordon Wyatt) [264]	2032	Comment	<p><i>Wording of Policy not considered accurate and it is suggested that Policy CS2.1, is amended to read as follows:</i></p> <p><i>"1. Ensure that all development proposals within the Central Seafront Area are accompanied by a Habitats Regulations Assessment and associated documentation to ensure there will be no adverse effect on the European and International foreshore designations (SPA and Ramsar) either alone or in combination with other plans or projects;"</i></p> <p>The Habitats Directive requires competent authorities to decide whether or not a plan or project can proceed having undertaken the following "appropriate assessment requirements" to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine whether a plan or project may have a significant effect on a European site, either alone or in combination; 2. If required (ie when there is a likely significant effect), undertake an appropriate assessment of the plan or project; 3. Decide whether there may be an adverse effect on the integrity of the European site in light of the appropriate assessment. <p>This whole process is generally referred to as Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).</p> <p>The responsibility for carrying out a HRA rests squarely upon the decision-making competent authority; except insofar as it may be appropriate for the competent authority to adopt the reasoning or conclusions of another competent authority as to whether a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a European site, or will adversely affect the integrity of a European site. The Regulations transposing the Habitats Directive also provide that a competent authority is not required to assess any implications of a plan or project that would be more appropriately assessed by another competent authority. Planning applications are often accompanied by a document which is described as being a HRA; however such a document produced by or on behalf of an applicant does not have any legal weight and is therefore sometimes referred to as a 'shadow HRA'. As the competent authority, it remains Southend-on-Sea Borough Council's responsibility to produce the definitive HRA; either by adopting an applicant's 'shadow HRA', or by carrying out its own HRA. Where a competent authority chooses to carry out its own HRA, it will normally require the applicant to provide the necessary background information to support the assessment process.</p>	<p>Noted. It is proposed to amend the wording of Policy CS2 point 1 to read: <i>'Ensure that all development proposals within the Central Seafront Area are accompanied by a Habitats Regulations Assessment and associated documentation to ensure there will be no adverse effect on the European and International foreshore designations (SPA and Ramsar) either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.'</i></p>
-------------------------	---	------	---------	--	--

Question 28, CS2.3	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2353	Comment	Policy CS2.3 - Under what circumstances could there be development and what is the 'public interest' that could make this possible.	Policy CS2.3 provides for exceptional circumstances where exceptions may be made if there are no alternative solutions or the reasons for the development clearly outweigh the nature conservation value of the site and is in the public interest. Potential flood defence improvements may be an example of where this might apply. No changes proposed.
Question 28, CS2.6	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2354	Comment	Policy CS2.6 - Would want to know more about 6 and what kind of high quality visitor facility is envisaged	Such a facility would be subject to a planning application and wider publicity where more detailed information will be available. No changes proposed.
Question 28	Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [334]	2425	Support	We are supportive of this policy which seeks to relieve pressures on the seafront area. We support the idea of drawing people to the waterfront, especially where it may help to raise awareness of the ecosystems and their importance, provided the sensitive areas themselves are protected.	Noted.
The Waterfront					
Question 29, CS3	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1956	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing the Waterfront	Noted.
Question 29, CS3	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2287	Comment	Provide public Slipways over beach to promote use of small (sail) boats.	Public slipways are provided along the foreshore. The Plan (Policy CS3) seeks to improve such facilities as appropriate. No changes are proposed.
Question 29, CS3	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2355	Comment	Similar to above in that it appears to open the possibility of development which could be manipulated. Transparency will be required in both nature conservation and the waterfront.	The policy wording is considered to achieve an appropriate balance between protecting the waterfront whilst seeking to provide improved leisure facilities. No changes proposed.

Question 29, CS3	Procurement Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2391	Comment	People come to the sea side to sit on the beach so create more sand beaches. Yes there are small stretches that have been rejuvenated, however a lot more of the water front and shoreline need to be more accessible and enlarged, with the spits rebuilt and sand infilled to create beaches the length of the seafront; yes there are natural sites of interest and beach expansion can still happen if managed correctly. Reclaimed beaches across the world are the main success of any area. Example being the new beaches in Gibraltar which were introduced with sheltered sea walls has been the main success of those areas. The beach rather than the seafront road is the most important part of Southend when it comes to attracting tourism and local well-being and fitness.	Policy CS3 promotes the beach and foreshore for appropriate cultural, leisure and tourism activities. Specific proposals for the maintenance of the beach and foreshore is implemented through other Council services. No changes proposed.
Question 29, CS3	Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [334]	2426	Support	We support this policy which seeks to integrate tourism activities and recreation with the public realm and biodiversity features. We are particularly supportive of Point 2, which seems to prevent any impacts on biodiversity or flood risk.	Noted.
Victoria Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area – Policy PA8, Opportunity Site 11, 12 and 13					
Question 30, PA8	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1957	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the Victoria Avenue Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area	Noted.
Question 30, PA8	London Southend Airport (Ms Jo Marchetti) [471]	1969	Support	We support the regeneration of this area as it is the entrance point to Central Southend from the airport by road. The area currently is not appealing and is run down. The airport is keen to push inbound passengers into the town before heading to London and this area needs to be more attractive in appearance in order for us to market Southend's tourism sites.	Noted.
Question 30	Rev Phyllis Owen [456]	1976	Comment	Whilst I agree these are good objectives, the reality is that people want to use cars. I am very concerned that the number of additional dwellings proposed in my area (OS11 and OS12 and Roots Hall) will lead to even more cars looking for places to park, increasing the problems that already exist in these area. I have raised this point when previous plans for Victoria Avenue have been raised and have never received an adequate or indeed any response. I feel very strongly that existing residents will be greatly disadvantaged.	Development Proposals that come forward in the SCAAP area will have regard to the Councils parking standards set out in the Development Management Document. These have been found sound by a planning inspector and subsequently adopted.


Question 30, PA8	Burges Estates Residents Association [176]	2007	Comment	In the same way the Victoria Gateway policy principles contains reference to "promoting energy efficiency". Why is this policy area singled out? Why is that not one of a wide range of common policies applicable across the board?	All policy areas include reference to promoting energy efficiency.
Question 30, PA8	Burges Estates Residents Association [176]	2008	Comment	I have already mentioned that the church should be included in the area and that makes sense in the context of policy DP8: 7g.	St Marys Church is referenced in Policy DS2 – Key views and Policy DS3 – Landmarks and Landmark Buildings, and therefore development or infrastructure proposals that are likely to impact on the church will be required to have regard to the policy criteria contained within these policies. No change proposed.
Question 30, PA8	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [37]	2025	Comment	We would recommend within each Policy Area a requirement is stipulated that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve the area before development progresses.	Refer to Rep. 2017. Reference to this has been included within section 4.12 Infrastructure Provision. As it is a statutory undertaking it is not considered necessary to repeat it in planning policy. Noted. Additional supporting is proposed to be included in 4.12 Infrastructure Provision, referencing the need for developers to make provision for the foul sewerage network.
Question 30, PA8	Capitia Property Infrastructure On behalf of Genesis Housing [465]	2029	Comment	<p>The SCAAP preferred approach is supported. However, Capita P&I and Genesis consider that the OS11 site does not extend far enough, and that the adjacent Genesis site at Baxter Avenue should be incorporated within the OS11 site boundary. There are several reasons as to why, these are all explored in the supporting document. These considerations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall shortfall in housing supply and how the development of the site can help deliver the target; • The policy compliance of the proposal; • The removal of low quality housing; • Given the area of the site, a coherent regeneration masterplan approach should be adopted in accordance with OS11; • The site is well positioned on an access vista and therefore well located for a housing led regeneration initiative. <p>The site is available, achievable and deliverable. The redevelopment of the site would allow for the residential density of the site to be optimised, whilst also providing a quality mixed use development with active frontages.</p>	The Council is considering inclusion of this site as an opportunity site. This will be assessed against information supplied by the owners of the site to demonstrate that development is deliverable by 2021.

Question 30	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2108	Support	Wholeheartedly support the improvement on Victoria Avenue as a gateway in to the Town. The STOCKVALE GROUP recognises that much of this work is already underway with the on-going redevelopment of Heath and Carby House.	Noted. The Victoria Avenue/ Queensway junction has benefitted from significant public realm and access improvements as part as the implemented Victoria Gateway Scheme. However, it is considered that policy should still seek further improvements to the public realm and accessibility.
Question 30	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2147	Object	The proposed redevelopment of Roots Hall and Roots Hall Stadium are predicated on the Football Club relocating to Fossetts Farm with a significant volume of retail use. Whilst the redevelopment of these sites is supported the retail use and volume at Fossetts Farm would see the end of the High Street as a retail offer. The BID most strongly opposes the Fossetts Farm proposals and any movement of retail away from the SCAAP area and Town Centre.	The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundaries. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact was taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study). Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy and require a further retail impact assessment. No changes are proposed.
Question 30	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2259	Comment	Victoria Neighbourhood was scored by 22% of respondents as a top 10 priority.	Noted.
Question 30	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2262	Comment	Whilst the BID do not object or have any particular concern regarding the moving of the Southend Football Club the move is predicted on the suggested development requirement to combine a significant number of retail outlets. This is being presented as a financial necessity to allow the Club to move to new premises, however, if this is supported many if not all the High Street chains are likely to follow.	Noted.

Question 30, OS13	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2270	Object	<p>Another major issue for the BID is the opportunity site (OS13) re-development of Roots Hall, and Roots Hall Stadium. There is extreme concern that the redevelopment of these sites is predicated on Southend Football Club moving out to Fossetts Farm and the supposed enabling development to allow this to happen, which consists of a large quantum of A1 retail units. As highlighted earlier in this representation the retail proposals at Fossetts Farm would be fatal to Southend's retail offer in the High Street and the aspirations for a vast improvement to the retail provision in the SCAAP area.</p>	<p>Noted. Opportunity Site 13 and will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the sites will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021. Nevertheless the development principles as set out in Policy PA8, in combination with other adopted local policy and guidance, will provide the necessary framework to guide development if a proposal was to come forward.</p> <p>The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundaries. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study). Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy and require a sequential test and further retail impact assessment. No changes are proposed.</p>
Question 30 PA8, OS13	Mr Alan Grubb [59]	2290	Comment	<p>OS13 - As the parking situation in the ladder roads which connect Fairfax Drive with West Road/Westborough Road is chronic, if planning permission is granted for additional housing on the Roots Hall site, the parking provision on the site does need if possible to be increased by 15% above the normal requirements.</p>	<p>Any planning application on the Roots Hall site would be determined in accordance with adopted car parking standards as set out in the Development Management Document. No changes are proposed.</p>
Question 30 PA8, OS13	Mr Alan Grubb [59]	2291	Comment	<p>OS13 - The site used by Prospects Collage located next to Roots Hall was to become part of the Sainsbury development. There is a strong possibility that if Sainsbury do not buy the site, the site will be used for additional housing development. Last year the company Lidi wanted to buy the Prospect site to build a Lidi store.</p> <p>As the site also includes a car park, in my view this development would have been ideally suited for this location, providing employment and services to the local community which would also include the new housing development on the Roots Hall Site. Southend Council should re-engage with Lidi in order to reach a successful conclusion.</p>	<p>OS 13 provides for the development of a mixed use scheme which may include a retail outlet. No changes are proposed.</p> <p>Opportunity Site 13 and will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the sites will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021.</p>

Question 30, PA8, OS11	Mr Alan Grubb [59]	2292	Comment	OS11 – <i>With reference to the redevelopment of the</i> old college site, located next to the Civic Centre, new homes <i>proposed in</i> Victoria Avenue old offices (Heath House and Carby House), parking of vehicles will be a problem unless the developers of large developments are forced to provide parking 15% in excess of the developments requirements. There is also a need for more Social Housing, Houses not Flats. I understand that additional housing in the High Street and possible Elmer Approach is also being contemplated.	Any planning application on these sites will be determined in accordance with adopted car parking standards. The provision of social housing will be sought in accordance with planning policy as appropriate. No changes are proposed.
Question 30 PA8	Mr Alan Grubb [59]	2293	Comment	While I accept the need for additional housing, there does need to be provision for additional school places and a location identified for a new primary school. To this effect I did suggest that serious consideration should be given to the building of a primary school on the old goods yard site at Prittlewell Rail Station. If a school is built on this site, the school would serve the population (children) who would be living in the new housing estates mentioned above and below and in close proximity to all of the proposed developments. Any new school must be built at the same time as the new developments are converted or built.	In terms of education provision the Plan considers that the planned population growth in the central area will be accommodated through the expansion of existing schools. However, it is recognised that in the longer term there may be a need for additional schools and this will be kept under review – see also Southend Infrastructure Delivery Plan. No changes are proposed.
Question 30, PA8.2	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2356	Comment	Policy PA8.2 - Concerns that <i>use of</i> backland for 'lanes' <i>type development</i> might occupy car park areas needed for the redevelopment of the substantial buildings in this area into residential and business units <i>forcing</i> cars on to the nearby streets causing problems.	Car parking provision will be taken into account in the detailed design and planning application stage of any scheme. No changes proposed.
Question 30, PA8.8g	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2357	Comment	Policy PA8.8g - This is a sensitive junction with an historic building and St, Mary's churchyard. While it will be the Council's intention to take care with any design and appointment of contractors some reassurance perhaps in the press would save questions from local people.	Noted.

Question 30, PA8	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2413	Comment	<p>Paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 relates to energy efficiency and relates to existing development. We note that versions of this paragraph appear under other policy areas and opportunity sites, so the following comments also apply.</p> <p>Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. Special considerations under Part L are also given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within registered parks and gardens and the curtilages of scheduled monuments, and buildings of traditional construction with permeable fabric that both absorbs and readily allows the evaporation of moisture. Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should note that the application will be different in relation to these classes of buildings. Further information can be found in the Historic England advice Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings –Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historically and traditionally constructed buildings https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-ptl/. <i>This similarly applies to Policy PA1, PA2, PA3, PA4, PA5, PA7, CS1, PA8 and PA9.</i></p>	<p>This point is noted. It is therefore proposed to reference this in paragraph 85 as follows: <i>‘Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.’</i></p> <p>It is proposed to add the words ‘as appropriate’ in paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 so that it reads, <i>‘Promote energy efficiency as appropriate, including.....’</i></p> <p>This would necessitate similar changes to all other policy areas.</p>
Question 30, PA8, OS11	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2418	Comment	<p>The Grade II museum building is within Opportunity Site 11 and reference should be made to conserving or enhancing its significance through the comprehensive redevelopment of the area.</p>	<p>Agreed. It is therefore proposed to add to the end of OS 11 the following, <i>‘The grade II listed old museum building will be conserved and its setting enhanced as part of the proposals for the policy area.’</i></p>
Question 30, PA8	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2462	Comment	<p>Victoria Avenue should be rebuilt with more safety features for pedestrians.</p> <p>The cycle route built on the footway outside the Civic centre should be removed.</p> <p>The road should be widened and the cycle track should be on the road, leaving the pavement clear for pedestrians.</p>	<p>These issues will be considered at the detailed design stage of any highway improvements.</p>
Question 30, Policy PA8	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2463	Comment	<p>Traffic lights at Victoria gateway and at the West Road, East Street junctions should have a red light phase to enable pedestrians to cross safely.</p>	<p>These issues will be considered at the detailed design stage of any highway improvements.</p>

Question 30, PA8	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2464	Comment	There is no mention of public toilets or parking for disabled people in the Victoria Gateway area , why not?	These issues would be considered as part of the detailed design of any planning application.
Sutton Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area – Policy PA9, Sites PA9.1, PA9.2, PA9.3 and Opportunity Site 14					
Question 31, PA9	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1958	Support	Agree with the proposed approach to managing development within the Sutton Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area	Noted.
Question 31, PA9	The Co-Operative Group (Mr A Thompson) [473]	1972	Object	<p>The Co-operative Group would wish to see the inclusion of land at 53-57 Sutton Road Southend within the SCAAP as an additional Opportunity Site.</p> 	The Council is considering inclusion of this site as an opportunity site. This will be assessed against information supplied by the owners of the site to demonstrate that development is deliverable by 2021.
Question 31, PA9	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [37]	2026	Comment	We would recommend within each Policy Area a requirement is stipulated that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is in place to serve the area before development progresses.	<p>Refer to Rep. 2017.</p> <p>Reference to this has been included within section 4.12 Infrastructure Provision. As it is a statutory undertaking it is not considered necessary to repeat it in planning policy.</p> <p>Noted. Additional supporting is proposed to be included in 4.12 Infrastructure Provision, referencing the need for developers to make provision for the foul sewerage network.</p>

Question 31	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2134	Support	Support the Councils aspiration but have no further comments to make in relation to the Sutton Neighbourhood. The STOCKVALE GROUP also support the improvements to connect the Sutton Neighbourhood into the Town Centre, improve connections to key public transport nodes and retail and employment areas.	Noted.
Question 31	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2237	Support	Support the Councils aspiration but have no further comments to make in relation to the Sutton Neighbourhood. The BID also support the improvements to connect the Sutton Neighbourhood into the Town Centre, improve connections to key public transport nodes and retail and employment areas.	Noted.
Question 31	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2258	Comment	Sutton Neighbourhood was scored by 22% of respondents as a top 10 priority.	Noted.

Question 31, PA9	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2414	Comment	<p>Paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 relates to energy efficiency and relates to existing development. We note that versions of this paragraph appear under other policy areas and opportunity sites, so the following comments also apply.</p> <p>Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. Special considerations under Part L are also given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within registered parks and gardens and the curtilages of scheduled monuments, and buildings of traditional construction with permeable fabric that both absorbs and readily allows the evaporation of moisture. Any policy encouraging energy efficiency should note that the application will be different in relation to these classes of buildings. Further information can be found in the Historic England advice Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings –Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historically and traditionally constructed buildings https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/energy-efficiency-historic-buildings-ptl/. <i>This similarly applies to Policy PA1, PA2, PA3, PA4, PA5, PA7, CS1, PA8 and PA9.</i></p>	<p>This point is noted. It is therefore proposed to reference this in paragraph 85 as follows: <i>‘Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.’</i></p> <p>It is proposed to add the words ‘as appropriate’ in paragraph 4 of Policy PA6 so that it reads, <i>‘Promote energy efficiency as appropriate, including.....’</i></p> <p>This would necessitate similar changes to all other policy areas.</p>
Question 31	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2465	Comment	<p>In the Sutton Gateway neighbourhood this whole area is not very clear about open spaces and I would like to know what this means.</p>	<p>This refers to the Opportunity Site 14 at Sutton Road and the potential to incorporate open space within the development scheme.</p>
Part D: Implementation and Monitoring Framework					
Development Phasing					
Question 32	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1959	Support	<p>Agree with the indicative phasing of development within the SCAAP area</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Question 32	The Co-Operative Group (Mr A Thompson) [473]	1973	Object	The Co-operative Group would wish to see the inclusion of land at 53-57 Sutton Road Southend within the SCAAP as an additional Opportunity Site.	The Council is considering inclusion of this site as an opportunity site. This will be assessed against information supplied by the owners of the site to demonstrate that development is deliverable by 2021.
Question 32	Capitia Property Infrastructure On behalf of Genesis Housing [465]	2031	Comment	<p>The SCAAP preferred approach is supported. However, Capita P&I and Genesis consider that the OS11 site does not extend far enough, and that the adjacent Genesis site at Baxter Avenue should be incorporated within the OS11 site boundary. There are several reasons as to why, these are all explored in the supporting document. These considerations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall shortfall in housing supply and how the development of the site can help deliver the target; • The policy compliance of the proposal; • The removal of low quality housing; • Given the area of the site, a coherent regeneration masterplan approach should be adopted in accordance with OS11; • The site is well positioned on an access vista and therefore well located for a housing led regeneration initiative. <p>The site is available, achievable and deliverable. The redevelopment of the site would allow for the residential density of the site to be optimised, whilst also providing a quality mixed use development with active frontages.</p>	The Council is considering inclusion of this site as an opportunity site. This will be assessed against information supplied by the owners of the site to demonstrate that development is deliverable by 2021.

Indicative Figures for SCAAP Potential New Developments

Question 33	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1960	Support	Believe it to be useful to include indicative figures for potential new development to enable private sector partners to fully appreciate the level of commitment required which will help to facilitate partnership working and delivery	Noted.
-------------	---	------	---------	---	--------

Implementation – Projects and Tasks

Question 34	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1961	Support	Agree. Please see response to question 33 <i>'Believe it to be useful to include indicative figures for potential new development to enable private sector partners to fully appreciate the level of commitment required which will help to facilitate partnership working and delivery'.</i>	Noted.
Implementation - Approach					
Question 35	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1962	Support	Agree with overall approach for the Implementation Plan	Noted.
Question 35	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2358	Comment	Regular updates on progress of projects would be valuable. The Council needs to be in control of its own plan and not be unduly influenced by the objectives of partners.	Progress is regularly provided in Annual Monitoring Reports.
SCAAP Monitoring Framework					
Question 36	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1963	Support	Agree with Monitoring Framework	Noted.
General and Further Comments					
Question 37	Essex Chambers of Commerce (Mr John Dallaway) [452]	1964	Support	No further comments	Noted.

Question 37	London Southend Airport (Ms Jo Marchetti) [471]	1970	Support	Overall LSA strongly supports the redevelopment of the areas outlined in the SCAAP documents and is pleased to see that improvements are planned for the area which will in turn make it easier to attract inbound visitors.	Noted.
Question 37	Milton Conservation Society (Mr Andy Atkinson) [488]	1981	Comment	Town centre planning in Southend (as in many other towns it has to be acknowledged) has been little short of disastrous since the war with only odd examples of good buildings. The last people to build to a consistently high quality were the Edwardians, saying very little for modern town planning. If we can adopt the right, aggregated approach with genuinely good quality architecture we might start again to build a long term high quality, human town centre where the best retailers want to participate, mixed uses can succeed and the town might earn the thriving city status it so wants.	The SCAAP seeks to promote design excellence and good quality development proposals and public realm improvements to reinforce a distinctive sense of place. The importance of high quality, innovative design is also set out within the Development Management Document Policy DM1 and further guidance contained within the Design and Townscape Guide SPD. No changes are proposed.
Question 37	Ms Lise Hodgson [467]	1986	Comment	Finally I would ask the Council to be more open with your plans. When I bought my flat my solicitor did the usual searches and got told there were no plans for the area. A few months later the first plans for Seaway were published. I do not believe these were drawn up in such a short time. I know the Council does not have a legal obligation to reveal plans, but surely you have a MORAL obligation so that people can make the right decision where to live. Had I known about the Council's plans for this area I would have saved myself the heartache I'm going through now and not bought the flat.	The SCAAP has been subject to extensive public consultation since 2007. The development potential of Seaway Car Park has been recognised for a number of years and was identified in earlier iterations of the Plan and other plans (adopted Borough Local Plan, March 1994). No changes are proposed.
Question 37 Part A, Strategic Planning Context	Burges Estates Residents Association [176]	1989	Comment	Reference is made to work being jointly undertaken to establish jobs and housing need. Jointly with whom? And is <i>there a</i> need to review the core strategy in the light of that further work. What timescales are we talking about? To what extent will anyone be able place any reliance on the SCAAP knowing it is so very tentative?	The SCAAP seeks to deliver the remaining growth targets for the town centre and central area set out in the Core Strategy by 2021. Paragraph 7 of the SCAAP explains the preparation of a new Southend Local Plan. It will replace the existing Core Strategy and include a review of the SCAAP. Evidence on housing and economic need is being prepared by the south Essex authorities.
Question 37 Context G	Burges Estate Residents Association [176]	1991	Comment	On page 7 there is reference to successful recent public realm and access improvement schemes. Some examples would be useful because I cannot think of them.	Such schemes include City Beach and Victoria Gateway. It is not considered necessary to reference these in the context and issues section.

Question 37	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2066	Comment	Changes in consumer behaviour, the growth in car ownership and its impact on accessibility of in and out of Town Centre shopping are reasonably well understood. This is particularly likely to be an issue should the Council grant the Fossetts Farm application to subsequently increase a retail offer in an out of town centre location.	Noted.
Question 37	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2068	Comment	The growth of out of town shopping centre has been widely blamed for Town Centre decline and planning policies have attempted to restrict this growth, which the Stockvale Group wish to see reflected in the Council's determination of planning applications at Fossetts Farm. (The outcome of Planning Applications for extensive retail at Fossetts Farm will determine the value of the Council progressing the SCAAP process. If Fossetts Farm retail development is approved the Stockvale Group feel the SCAAPs aspirations will be undeliverable.	The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundary. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact was taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study). Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy provisions and require a further retail impact assessment. No changes are proposed.

Question 37	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2168	Comment	Changes in consumer behaviour, the growth in car ownership and its impact on accessibility of in and out of Town Centre shopping are reasonably well understood. This is particularly likely to be an issue should the Council grant the Fossetts Farm application to subsequently increase a retail offer in an out of town centre location.	Noted.
Question 37	Stockvale Group representing Sands & Southend Radio, Three Shells, Pavilion, Adventure Island, Adventure Sealife (Mr S Kearney) [483]	2170	Comment	The growth of out of town shopping centre has been widely blamed for Town Centre decline and planning policies have attempted to restrict this growth, which the Stockvale Group wish to see reflected in the Council's determination of planning applications at Fossetts Farm. (The outcome of Planning Applications for extensive retail at Fossetts Farm will determine the value of the Council progressing the SCAAP process. If Fossetts Farm retail development is approved the Stockvale Group feel the SCAAPs aspirations will be undeliverable).	<p>The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundaries. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact was taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study).</p> <p>Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy and require a further retail impact assessment. No changes are proposed.</p>

Question 37	Southend Bid (Mr S Kearney) [496]	2264	Object	<p>In relation to the Fossetts Farm development. Proposals to have a large quantum of A1 retail provision would have a major impact on the Town Centre which is highly likely to lead to a further decline of an already struggling retail offer within the High Street and surrounding environs. Furthermore, the highway connection and infrastructure would not support the level of traffic journeys that the proposals at Roots Hall are likely to generate.</p> <p>The BID would ask that the Council ensure that in accordance with advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) a sequential test is undertaken and would like to be informed of the conclusions in relation to the impact on the vitality and viability of the Town Centre. The BID are rightly concerned that the Fossetts Farm proposals will have negative impact on the future of the High Street and the existing retail economy of the SCAAP area.</p>	<p>The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundaries. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study).</p> <p>Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy and require a sequential test and further retail impact assessment. No changes are proposed.</p>
Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2272	Comment	Ensure that all local parks have sufficient toilet facilities	Toilet provision is administered and maintained through associated Council services and will not be detailed within the SCAAP. No changes are proposed.
Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2273	Comment	In particular to insist that the Tea-shop / Café in Southchurch park is regularly cleaned, re-painted and that an appropriate menu is available.	This is outside the plan area.
Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2274	Comment	Maintain the Free Bus passes for elderly residents	This is not a planning matter.
Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2275	Comment	Ensure there are Police available to respond to incidents 24/7	This is not a planning matter.
Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2470	Comment	Crack down on crime	The Plan in association with other local planning policy seeks to achieve quality design in new developments to design out crime, to maintain and upgrade CCTV provision where appropriate. No changes are proposed.
Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2277	Comment	Educate people Out of Spitting in public	This is not a planning matter.
Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2278	Comment	Action heavily on people for not picking-up their dog's Faeces	This is not a planning matter.
Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2282	Comment	Ensure local Tax-breaks, of Real Value, to attract New / Start-up businesses	This is not a planning matter.
Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2283	Comment	Provide for local residents to travel to Pier head Free or Half-price	Pricing of leisure and tourism facilities is not a planning issue.
Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2288	Comment	Widely advertise Air routes from Southend Airport	Outside the Plan area and not a planning matter.

Question 37	Mr Rod Levin [497]	2289	Comment	Review plans for Old Leigh. It has the potential for a First Rate Marina and Pleasure-land with residential and Hotel accommodation. Develop as 'Oldie-World'.	This is outside the plan area.
Question 37	Mr Paul Bethell [499]	2316	Comment	It is far too technical for most people not involved in planning to understand	A non-technical summary document was published along with the Preferred Approach version. A similar document will be published with the Proposed Submission Plan.
Question 37	Belfairs Garden Residents Association (Barbara Armitage) [511]	2359	Comment	The demographics have not been considered. There are statistics to show that the proportion of older people in Southend will increase. With age these people will become less able or mobile and therefore it is unlikely that the emphasis on walking or cycling will be viable. The plan is based on more active folk to the detriment of those who are living longer and still expect a reasonable quality of life.	It is considered that the Plan adequately addresses the needs of all road users. No changes proposed.
Question 37	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2374	Comment	This process has not been made user friendly at all and it even appears to have been made deliberately complex so that the general public get lost in legal jargon and policy grammar. You will not gain a real sense of what Southend people want or need through a complex series of download PDFs and this form!	Public consultation has been carried out throughout the Plan making process and every effort has been made to make the documents as 'user friendly' as possible. A non-technical summary document was published along with the Preferred Approach version. A similar document will be published with the Proposed Submission Plan.
Question 37	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2384	Comment	Southend-On-Sea Council need to draw large companies out of London and encourage large build office space and technology parks on the outskirts of the city.	Noted. The SCAAP only covers the central area of the town.
Question 37	Procuresure Consulting (Mr Barrie Evans) [513]	2394	Comment	Like it or not the founding reasons of Southend's original success was rich London families who wanted to live by the sea. Their money was its reason for success and the city needs that cash injection again. Attracting London professionals to the area would not force out social or affordable housing but actually pay for it, create jobs and maintain a balance in society which Southend Centre currently lacks. This would also break down that Leigh On Sea and Southend social divide which is ridiculous as Southend itself could be far nicer than crammed in Leigh On Sea with its lack of sea front and crammed streets.	Noted.
Question 37	Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [514]	2396	Support	Pleased to see that heritage has been integrated into the plan. We do not have any over-riding concerns in relation to the plan.	Noted.

Question 37	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2466	Comment	<p>When considering any of this plan you must take in to account your responsibilities under the Equality Act.</p> <p>With the numbers of elderly and disabled people that will live in Southend during the next ten years I do not think you have taken enough account of it. No listed Sheltered housing, no day centre facilities for disabled people, no parking for disabled people, no facilities for guide dog owners or other assistance dogs, no public toilets.</p> <p>The maps referred to were not explained on the cd so I could not comment on them.</p> <p>There were many references to your Website which I and many other blind people do not have access to.</p>	The Plan seeks to provide facilities for all users that are safe and accessible. The SCAAP will be accompanied by an Equalities Impact Assessment.
Question 37	National Federation for the Blind (Mrs Jill Allen-King) [516]	2467	Comment	<p>Millions of pounds were wasted on the Travel Centre, Victoria Gateway and City beach. Before wasting millions of pounds will the Council please consult with local residents and listen to what we say and not ignore us like you did in 1970 and in 2006 and 2008.</p> <p>When consulting Stakeholders, please include all residents living in the Southend district and not only a few listed in your appendix.</p>	Appropriate public consultation in line with statutory requirements is carried out at all stages of plan preparation.
Question 37	Amec Foster Wheeler on behalf of National Grid [519]	2468	Comment	We have no comment to make	Noted.

Appendix 4: Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (2015) – Detailed Summary of Workshop Comments Held on 20th and 21st January 2016

During the workshop sessions ‘discussion stations’ were made available, which included material to depict and summarise each proposed Policy Area of the Southend Central Area Plan (SCAAP). Participants were able to comment on each Policy Area and were asked to do so under the following themes: ‘Support/ like’; ‘What is missing’; ‘What can be improved’; ‘Other issues’. The matters raised during the workshops, together with response, are provided below.

Note: that any reference made in this document to changes to specific text or sections of the Southend central Area Action Plan will be in relation to the December 2015 version i.e. the Preferred Approach

Support/ Like
What is Missing
What can be Improved?
Other Issues

PA1 - High Street Policy Area		Response
	PUBLIC	
H1	Improve quality of shops	Noted; although the Council cannot control the ‘quality’ or type of shop within the Town Centre, the SCAAP seeks to support retail in the High Street Policy Area. Further, Policy PA1 seeks to enhance the public realm of the High Street, thereby adding to the appeal of the area, which may attract additional retail providers. In addition the Policy seeks to conserve and restore historical shopfronts. Also, in respect of shop frontages, the SCAAP in Policy DS1: Maintaining a Prosperous Retail Centre seeks to ensure that all new frontages will be of a high standard of design that is compatible with the architectural style and character of the building and surrounding area.
H2	Victoria circus public events space	Noted. Policy PA1: High Street Policy Area Development Principles seeks to transform and enhance the existing public space at Victoria Circus, enabling use for public events.
H3	High street lighting very good	Noted.
H4	Vibrancy	Noted.
H5	Public events space very attractive to young people – helps attract more footfall &	Noted. See response to H2.

	possible expenditure	
H6	Piazza idea sounds good	Noted. See response to H2.
	COUNCILLOR	
H7	Broadening the High Street to create vibrant segments	The SCAAP seeks to support the broadening of the High Street through the provision of quality pedestrian links and the allocation of sites for development that may help create 'retail circuits'.
H8	Connections between seafront & town centre	Noted. The desire to improve linkages between the seafront and the High Street are highlighted in the Central Seafront Area, the High Street, Tylers and Clifftown Development Principles.
H9	Pedestrianisation of High Street and London Road	Noted. Policy PA2: London Road encourages this on a new pedestrianised section which also includes provision for a street market.
	PUBLIC	
H10	Must include provision of new toilet block, which needs to be central	There are a number of public conveniences within the Town Centre and located close to the High Street. It is not considered necessary for the SCAAP to deal with such a detailed issue, which will be addressed by other teams within the Council or during the design stage of a planning proposal.
H11	Under-deeping – skate board park needed in town centre	The Deeping provides service access to the Victoria's shopping centre.
H12	Create a large open multi-purpose space linking High Street to Forum Piazza (remove buildings to give large central space)	There is no accompanying evidence that such a measure would be deliverable or viable during the SCAAP's plan period and therefore no reference is made.
H13	There is no point in building on car parks if shopping areas are to be viable. Out of town shopping will be more attractive	The SCAAP seeks to improve the quality of access to parking so that it is convenient, well-signposted, safe and secure. Further the SCAAP will seek to maintain capacity at a level that supports the vitality and viability of the town centre and enables the delivery of relevant opportunity sites. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
H14	More trees and landscaping	All Policy Area's include provision to enhance urban greening through landscaping or tree planting.
H15	Café culture on High Street	Policy DS1: Maintaining a Prosperous Retail Centre sets out an approach for managing town centre frontages. In recognising the changing role of shopping patterns and the positive contribution of non-A1 retail units, particularly 'cafes', the SCAAP sets a lower threshold for A1 retail use within Town Centre Primary Shopping Frontage, thereby allowing the potential provision of more cafes along

		the High Street.
H16	Using empty shop fronts for community projects, such as Slack Space project in Colchester	<p>Policy DS1 seeks to encourage the landowner/landlord to display local art within the windows of empty shops to create visual interest from the public realm.</p> <p>Slack Space is not an element of the Development Plan in Colchester. Rather it is a project that is not covered by planning policy.</p>
	BUSINESS	
H17	Provision of public toilets at OS2	<p>Opportunity Site 2 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021.</p>
H18	Make it clear we support residential on upper floors above shops	Policy PA1: High Street Policy Area Development Principles provides support for a net increase in dwellings above commercial development. Furthermore Policy DS1: Maintaining a Prosperous Retail Centre sets out support for a range of uses, including residential, above town centre shopping frontages.
H19	Signage at the top and bottom of high street for directions to seafront with distances	Noted. Additional provision will be made in Policy PA1: High Street Policy Area Development Principles to link the town centre and the central seafront through improved signage and public art. The aim of improving linkages between the seafront and the High Street are highlighted in the Central Seafront Area, the High Street, Tylers and Clifftown Development Principles Policies.
	COUNCILLOR	
H20	Central glass roof with panels to provide cover and seating for restaurants	There is no accompanying evidence that such a measure would be deliverable or viable during the SCAAP's plan period and therefore no reference is made.
H21	Allow traffic down the high street	Allowing traffic down the High Street would adversely impact the setting and public realm and hinder pedestrian flows between shops and services. No change proposed.
	PUBLIC	
H22	Victoria Circus has limited potential as a public event space as it's not flat	Noted, although it is considered that the existing public space at Victoria Circus could be enhanced and a suitable area provided for a range of public events despite the gradient in floor level and this is acknowledged in the Policy for the High Street PA1: High Street Policy Area Development Principles.

H23	Consider motor cycle parking in the town centre as much has been lost at The Forum and if Alexandra street might go	<p>The SCAAP seeks to promote a positive approach to public car parking provision that provides levels that support the vitality of the town centre and access to the seafront by encouraging improvements to the quality of access to parking so that it is convenient, well-signposted, safe and secure.</p> <p>It is considered that reference to a range of parking types, including for motorcycle's, should be made within Policy DS5.</p> <p>The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
H24	Like the idea of extra public space away from the high street, e.g. pier entrance	Noted.
H25	If the top end of the High Street is developed for 'eating out' ensure there is a close drop off for taxis for the elderly and disabled	Noted. The SCAAP seeks to provide provision for the relocation of taxi facilities close to the top end of the High Street, west of College Way on London Road, its specific location and facilities to be determined in consultation with taxi providers.
H26	Abandon out of town developments – Garon park and Fossetts Farm are wrong	These areas are outside of the SCAAP boundary and are not covered by its policy. However, Policy DS1: Maintaining a Prosperous Retail Centre does refer to the Southend adopted Core Strategy, which establishes the town centre as the first preference for retail and town centre development within the Borough. Within Policy DS1, further reference will also be made to the National Planning Policy Framework, which reinforces the town centre first approach for locating retail and town centre uses.
H27	Street furniture – current dazzles in the sunlight and the pavement is a trip hazard	Noted. The Council has now adopted a Streetscape Manual Supplementary Planning Document that provides guidance to ensure a coordinated, high quality, user friendly streetscape is sustainably achieved within the Borough, including any improvements to the High Street such as new street furniture and paving.
H28	Create some nice features in the High Street, as was there previously – wooded seating and surrounding flower beds	Noted. The SCAAP seeks to maintain and improve the High Street as public space for pedestrians, addressing the principles of the Southend Streetscape Manual and by providing quality landscapes including urban greening and tree planting. The Streetscape Manual also includes a palette of agreed materials.
H29	There needs to be additional parking provision	The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the

		car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
H30	Improve access/ view of High Street from Vic. Circus – remove part of New Look for fantastic views down the high street	Noted, provision included within Policy PA2 that promotes improved pedestrian access and legibility from Victoria Gateway to the High Street. If circumstances were to arise the Council would always explore with developers/owners ways to improve the aesthetics and functioning of the High Street and Central Area.
H31	Narrow alley way from Victoria Gateway to the High Street is horrible	Noted, provision included within Policy PA2 that promotes improved pedestrian access and legibility from Victoria Gateway to the High Street. If circumstances were to arise the Council would always explore with developers/owners ways to improve the aesthetics and functioning of the High Street and Central Area.
H32	Need to get a better visual aspect of the Forum from the High Street – even if it means redevelopment of some current buildings	<p>The Forum is identified as a Landmark Building in Policy DS3: Landmarks and Landmark Buildings and, therefore, policy seeks to enhance the setting and views of the building from new development and via public realm improvements.</p> <p>Further reference to landmark buildings and Policy DS3: Landmarks and Landmark Buildings will be made to Policy PA3.</p>
H33	Turn the former subterranean toilets, opposite old Mothercare) into a coffee shop – like “The Attendant” in London	The subterranean toilets in the High Street were shut and covered over many years ago. It has not been considered environmentally appropriate or economically viable to try and re-open such facilities at the present time. This does not preclude the Council considering something in the future if it was considered to meet the criteria above and someone made an approach.
H34	More independent shops	Although the SCAAP can manage Use Classes (under the Use Class Order) from a planning perspective, it cannot control the type of premises that come under the same umbrella use class. For instance, Policy DS1: Maintaining a Prosperous Retail Centre seeks to control the proportion of A1 retail within designated Town Centre Primary Frontages, however, the SCAAP cannot be specific on the type of A1 use, including whether a shop is ‘independent’ or not.
H35	Tramway in the High Street	There is inadequate evidence that a tramway would be deliverable or viable during the SCAAP’s plan period and therefore no specific policy reference is made in the document. However, Policy DS5 seeks to improve public transport. Innovative schemes such as tram provision may be considered as part of wider traffic management proposals having regard to economic feasibility.
H36	Allow taxi down the High Street in the evening would make it feel safer and less desolate	This is not considered a viable proposal given the facilities that would need to be located in the pedestrianised High Street and that taxis would need to drive on this surface. Taxi’s are able to drop off and pick up close to the High Street in the

		adjoining side roads, and can also gain access to the vehicular service area in the southern end of the High Street.
H37	More trees and greenery	All Policy Area's include provision to enhance urban greening through landscaping or tree planting.
H38	Need to improve the appearance of some of the buildings, e.g. BHS	<p>The Council has limited control in improving the appearance of private buildings. However, the SCAAP makes extensive policy reference for improving the public realm in the town centre and central area. If a building was considered for redevelopment in the future, there may be opportunity to address the exterior appearance as part of a planning application.</p> <p>Further, Policy DM1 – Design Quality of the Development Management Document, outlines that the Council will support good quality, innovative design that contributes positively to the creation of successful places, and development proposals should add to the overall quality of an area.</p>
H39	Vic Circus - Public spaces need to be provided at varying levels and must be accessible	Noted. Policy PA1: High Street Policy Area Development Principles seeks to transfer and enhance the existing public space at Victoria Circus, enabling use for public events.
H40	Need to maintain side roads to high street for disabled parking & access to buses and provide public toilets – don't want High Street at varying levels	The side roads already provide facilities for disabled parking. Plans to pedestrianise some of the stub end roads will take into account the provision of all users, including vulnerable users and disabled parking needs, at the design stage. The town centre also benefits from good transport links and further enhancement of these are proposed in the document. However, it is proposed that reference to the provision of disabled parking be included within Policy DS5.
	BUSINESS	
H41	Public events space needs levelling and flexible usage and street furniture needs careful consideration	<p>Noted, it is considered that the existing public space at Victoria Circus could be enhanced and provides a suitable area for a range of public events despite the gradient in floor level. The Council will have regard to the adopted Streetscape Manual Supplementary Planning Document in terms of potential future street furniture provision.</p> <p>Policy PA1: High Street Policy Area Development Principles seeks to transform and enhance the existing public space at Victoria Circus, enabling use for public events. Reference to flexibility of the design and layout of the public event space at Victoria Circus will be made in Policy PA1.</p>
H42	With regards to Southend Airport – develop sites that would encourage visitors to	Noted. The SCAAP includes an objective to encourage new development,

	the town centre	including visitor accommodation that enhances the leisure and tourism offer in the Plan area, having particular regard to the assets offered by the Central Seafront Area.
H43	Improve quality of shop near Vic. Station to encourage visitors into the High Street	Policy DS1: Maintaining a Prosperous Retail Centre seeks to improve the retail offer throughout the Southend Central Area.
H44	Shield the service area - looks terrible from Forum	Policy PA3: Elmer Square Policy Area Development Principles OS 3 identifies the detrimental visual impact of the service area, servicing High Street uses, has on the Forum development scheme. It seeks to promote environmental improvements as part of any development scheme for the site.
H45	Needs consultation and buy in from local business	Extensive public consultation has been carried out throughout the Plan making process, including with local businesses
H46	Central square needed in High Street, but not near the railway	There is no accompanying evidence that such a measure would be deliverable or viable during the SCAAP's plan period and therefore no reference is made. However, opportunities for enhancing the existing public space around the railway bridge will be made.
H47	Business concerned that large events space at Vic. Circus will go	Policy PA1: High Street Policy Area Development Principles seeks to transform and enhance the existing public space at Victoria Circus.
	COUNCILLOR	
H48	Cycle path down centre of High Street	Noted. This may be considered as part of the cycling strategy for improving accessibility in and around the town centre. The needs of cyclist would need to be considered and balanced with those of pedestrians, to ensure there wouldn't be any safety concerns that would need to be addressed.
H49	Need to address the linear nature of high street	It is considered that the proposed development at Queensway (OS4) and Tylers Avenue (OS6), together with widespread public realm improvements and pedestrianisation at London Road, Queensway and the High Street Stub-end roads encourage more lateral footfall across the High Street and help establish viable retail circuits.
H50	Create a central structure to maximise footfall at shop fronts, not walking down the centre	There is inadequate evidence that a central shelter running down the High Street would be deliverable or viable during the SCAAP's plan period and, therefore, no policy reference is made in the document
H51	New public space proposed at railway – would be better positioned at other junction (wider)	There is no accompanying evidence that such a measure would be deliverable or viable during the SCAAP's plan period and therefore no reference is made. However, opportunities for enhancing the existing public space around the railway bridge will be made.
H52	OS2 Pitmans Close – public toilets result in anti-social behaviour. Need to create a	Noted, however there is inadequate evidence that OS2 Pitman's Close will be

	more public friendly positive use here	<p>delivered during the SCAAP's plan period and, therefore, OS2 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the sites that are to be delivered after 2021.</p>
H53	Improved lighting to create interest and shows	Noted. Reference to improved lighting has been incorporated into Policy PA1.
H54	Potential for a café culture in the evening	<p>Policy DS1: Maintaining a Prosperous Retail Centre sets out an approach for managing town centre frontages. In recognising the changing role of shopping patterns and the positive contribution of non-A1 retail units, particularly 'cafes', the SCAAP sets a lower threshold for A1 retail use within Town Centre Primary Shopping Frontage, thereby allowing the potential provision of more cafes along the High Street. Further policy support for A3 cafes will be included in Policy DS1.</p> <p>The opening times of businesses within the town centre will be determined through the Licensing regime of premises.</p>
H55	Improve public experience by removing metal benches, burn in summer, freeze in winter	Any future installation of street furniture along the High Street will have regard to the adopted Streetscape Manual Supplementary Planning Document.
H56	Improve lighting	Noted, reference to improved lighting has been incorporated into Policy PA1.
H57	Livework units down side of High Street	Noted, it is proposed that policy reference that supports the provision of live-work units above existing or new commercial development will be included in Policy PA1.
	PUBLIC	
H58	If businesses are to trade with customers, then they need to come and go in cars. There must be car parking provision – not build on them all	<p>The SCAAP seeks to promote a positive approach to public car parking provision that provides public car parking levels that support the vitality of the town centre and access to the seafront by encouraging improvements to the quality of access to parking so that it is convenient, well-signposted, safe and secure.</p> <p>The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
H59	Could park and ride be considered	Park and Ride schemes have been considered a number of times in recent years but have not been considered feasible given the limited land available and linear peninsula geography of the town. Even so, the provision of Park and Ride would

		only be feasible outside the SCAAP boundaries. Such options will be kept under review as part of the Local Transport Plan and development of the Southend Local Plan.
	COUNCILLOR	
H60	Shops close too early	The SCAAP is not the appropriate document to set out opening times of businesses in the Town Centre. This is determined through the licensing regime of premises.
H61	No to café culture	Noted, however it is considered that cafes are a town centre use and can add to the vitality of a centre and enhance the experience of visitors.
H62	Too much cycling	The SCAAP seeks to provide for a range of sustainable transport improvements and options as an alternative to the car, which includes cycling.

PA2 - London Road Policy Area		Council Response
	PUBLIC	
L1	Tree Planting	Noted. Delivering tree planting and urban greening is included in the Policy Areas.
L2	Public Art	Noted. The provision of public art is included in the Policy Areas.
L3	Public art & signage consideration	Noted. See above (L2) and improved signage is included in Policy.
	BUSINESS	
L4	Market Space	Noted. Policy PA2: London Road Policy Area Development Principles includes provision for a street market.
L5	Street dining/ café space	Noted.
L6	Needs revamping as intended	Noted.
L7	Potential to lift aspirations of the area – quality market street food	Noted. Policy PA2: London Road Policy Area Development Principles includes provision for a street market.
L8	COUNCILLOR	
L9	Support Pedestrianisation	Noted.
L10	Pedestrianisation	Noted.
L11	Pedestrianisation	Noted.
L12	Open Market	Noted.
L13	Open Market	Noted.
L14	Victoria Gateway space good as mutli purpose, including skateboarding etc.	Noted.
L15	Victoria Gateway junction improvements	Noted.
	PUBLIC	
L16	Issue around safety of bus lane at Vic Gateway	Victoria Gateway shared surface will be monitored by the appropriate Council department to ensure that it is functioning safely. However how it operates is outside the scope of this Plan.
L17	BUSINESS	
L18	Electric and water provision for market	Noted, this level of detail will be considered during the implementation stage rather than be set out in the SCAAP document itself.
	COUNCILLOR	
L19	Continue with LED lighting	Noted.
L20	Better signage to toilets at Victoria Shopping Centre	It is considered that this level of detail is not required in the SCAAP. Further, the toilets provided in the Victoria Shopping Centre are not managed by the Council.
	PUBLIC	

L21	If pedestrianized then taxi drop off should be provided in Queens Road	The preferred option for the relocation of the taxi rank as identified in the SCAAP and depicted on the Policies Map is west of College Way on the London Road, however, the final location will be determined in consultation with taxi providers.
L22	Mixed-mode route to Elmer should not give cycle preference over pedestrians – each should have separate designated area	The intention is that the mixed mode route would prioritise pedestrians and cyclists in a way that is safe and in accordance with best practice and guidance. The specific detail of the scheme will be considered during the implementation stage to ensure that the needs of both users are addressed fully.
L23	Traffic signal phasing to be looked at, particularly Victoria Gateway	Traffic light phasing and timings are reviewed as part of wider traffic management proposals. This issue cannot be addressed by this Plan, and is a matter for other Council functions.
L24	If pedestrianised then need to have dedicated pedestrian walkways not shared with cyclists	Noted, If it is a mixed mode route that accommodates both pedestrians and cyclists it will be implemented in accordance with best practice and guidance. The specific detail of any scheme would be considered during the implementation stage to ensure that the needs of both users are addressed fully.
L25	Rethink of Victoria Gateway required to speed up traffic flow, e.g. two lanes west and filter lane north/ east	Victoria Gateway shared surface will be monitored by the appropriate Group at the Council to ensure that it is functioning safely. However how it operates is outside the scope of this Plan.
L26	Make statement outside of Vic Station. A big fountain would look good and more impressive than the small existing statue	The SCAAP in Policy PA2 includes provision for public art at this location.
L27	‘Soften’ this area – Cherry Blossom or small Silver Birch trees	Policy PA2 includes provision for tree planting and landscaping at this location
L28	Potential re-evaluation of Victoria junction with lanes to Vic Avenue and towards Sainsburys	This may be a matter for the Local Transport Plan to consider when it is reviewed.
L29	Improve Vic Gateway to improve traffic movements	This may be a matter for the Local Transport Plan to consider when it is reviewed.
L30	Cars + taxis leaving Vic Station should be made aware of buses coming down Vic Ave needed space to turn into bus stops outside station	This issue cannot be addressed by this Plan, and is a matter for other Council functions.
L31	Vic. Gateway share space a disaster. Unsafe, should be a crossing not having to dodge traffic including buses.	Victoria Gateway shared surface will be monitored by the appropriate Group at the Council to ensure that it is functioning safely. However how it operates is outside the scope of this Plan.
L32	Review and tweak road layout at Vic. Gateway to speed up traffic.	This may be a matter for the Local Transport Plan to consider when it is reviewed.
L33	London Road pedestrianisation should link to Queens Road and the Forum, create a gap mid-way along London Road	Noted, this proposal is unlikely to be deliverable within the SCAAP plan period, by 2021, and therefore cannot be included in the Plan. Proposals that are likely to be delivered after 2021 will be considered during the preparation of the Southend Local Plan.
L34	Taxi rank is needed for elderly and disabled to access shops and cinema. It needs to be retained here not moved further away.	The preferred option for the relocation of the taxi rank as identified in the SCAAP and on the Policies Map is west of College Way on the London Road, however, the location

		will be determined in consultation with taxi providers. This would allow for the pedestrianisation of the London Road which will improve pedestrian circulation and access in the area for all.
	BUSINESS	
L35	Keep the road network of the Deeping	The SCAAP does not include any proposals for the Deeping under Victoria Shopping Centre.
L36	COUNCILLOR	
L37	Any cycle route should be colour coded not lipped	Noted. Detailed consideration of cycle routes will be addressed at implementation stage and will take account of best practice and guidance.
L38	Bench for elderly people near the roundabout	Noted. However the SCAAP does not deal with the specific siting of street furniture.
L39	Public Toilets	Noted. However the SCAAP does not deal with the siting of toilets.
	PUBLIC	
L40	No loss of taxi rank	The SCAAP and its Policies Map sets out provision for the pedestrianisation of the London Road and the possible relocation the existing taxi rank west of College Way. The exact location of the taxi rank will be considered during the implementation stage and subject to consultation
L41	Open up walkway from station at New Look	Noted, this proposal is unlikely to be deliverable within the SCAAP plan period, by 2021, and therefore cannot be included in the Plan. Proposals that are likely to be delivered after 2021 will be considered during the preparation of the Southend Local Plan.
L42	Need regular and reliable bus service, including evenings, weekends and bank holidays	The SCAAP sets out measures to improve the bus service in the town centre, including within the Transport, Access and Public Realm Strategy set out in Appendix 5. However, determination a detailed bus service will be considered outside of the SCAAP in consultation with bus operators.
L43	Clearer marking of road boundaries is needed outside Vic station – clearer left and right road markings	Victoria Gateway shared surface will be monitored by the appropriate Group at the Council to ensure that it is functioning appropriately. However, operational matters including road markings are outside the scope of this Plan.
	COUNCILLOR	
L44	Via BID money more trees can be planted at London Road, Queensway and other residential areas including Milton	The SCAAP includes provision for tree planting and landscaping at these locations.

PA3 - Elmer Square Policy Area		Council Response
	PUBLIC	
E1	Love the area that has been created where the Forum is – this could really be a hub with new bars/ cafes with outside seating & patio heaters	Noted.
E2	A good space a good library	Noted.
E3	College looks good – surrounding area should compliment	Noted, the SCAAP includes provision to improve the public realm and the visual appearance of buildings in this location as well as development of the Elmer Square Phase 2.
E4	Great Library	Noted.
E5	Great Signposting	Noted.
E6	The Forum & Elmer Square has proved to be successful enterprise attracting young people – really nice and modern	Noted.
E7	Support OS3 opening up the High Street	Noted.
E8	Support OS3: Elmer Phase 2	Noted.
	PUBLIC	
E9	Improve the surrounding landscape	Reference will be included in Policy PA3 in respect to improved landscaping.
E10	Improve signage links with High Street	Specific reference to enhanced signage to the High Street will be incorporated within Policy PA3.
E11	Open Forum piazza to High Street by removal of buildings, creating large focal point to High Street and multi-use space	Noted, however this proposal is unlikely to be deliverable within the SCAAP deliverability period, by 2021, and therefore will not be included in the Plan. Proposals that may delivered after 2021 will be considered during the preparation of the Southend Local Plan.
E12	Should High Street buildings east of Forum Plaza be included in this Policy Area? They are relevant to the public space and link with Policy Area 1	Noted, Policy PA3 includes provision to enhance the visual appearance to the rear of buildings on the High Street that front onto the public space. However, it is considered that these buildings have a stronger relationship with the High Street and

		are therefore included within the High Street Policy Area.
E13	Maintain area outside of the Forum as open	PA3 includes Opportunity Site 3: Elmer Square Phase 2, which supports development proposals for education and supporting uses. PA3 also includes reference to 'public space' and 'public realm enhancements' in this location. Further reference to retaining outside high quality public space public space will be considered.
E14	Seating on the green space	The SCAAP does not set out the specific siting of seating or other street furniture. The specific layout and proposals for OS3 will be considered during the implementation stage and be subject to consultation.
	COUNCILLOR	
E15	Seating is not necessarily in the best locations	Noted, the SCAAP does not set out the specific siting of seating or other street furniture. The specific layout and proposals for OS3 will be considered during the implementation stage and be subject to consultation.
E16	Improve this green area for kids, perhaps play area	Noted, the SCAAP includes more general criteria for development in this location, including new educational and support facilities and public realm improvements. It is not considered necessary for the SCAAP to define the exact nature of these improvements. The specific layout and proposals for OS3 will be considered during the implementation stage and be subject to consultation.
	PUBLIC	
E17	More student accommodation in high rise building bounding Elmer Square and the High Street – rather than private flats	Noted, Policy PA3 seeks to ensure new student accommodation has a positive impact on the surrounding area. Policy PA3 does not contain any specific proposals for further residential development in this area. All planning applications will be considered on their merits and assessed against planning policy, including relevant policies contained within the SCAAP
E18	Route linking up to college	Noted.
E19	Bring the prudential building back into use – e.g. residential or commercial business use. This will help tackle anti-social behaviour	The Prudential Buildings has had a prior approval granted for change of use from office to residential. The scheme is for 72 flats. Under prior approval the Council only has control over certain aspects of the development and planning policy that would be applied under a planning application is not possible.
E20	Why include residential homes (West of college) & terrace houses (West of Forum) in this Policy Area?	It is considered necessary to include these residential properties within the plan to ensure any impact on their amenity from future development proposals identified for this area is taken into account.
	BUSINESS	
E21	This area if OK other than Prudential and other big buildings block access to	Noted. The Prudential Buildings has had a prior approval granted for change of use

	High Street	from office to residential. The scheme is for 72 flats. Under prior approval the Council only has control over certain aspects of the development and planning policy that would be applied under a planning application is not possible.
	COUNCILLOR	
E22	Improve ground floor activity, especially Prudential building	<p>The SCAAP seeks to designate the frontages along a section of Elmer Approach and Queens Road as Secondary Shopping Frontage, and thereby maintain active frontages and ensure new frontages are of a high standard of design.</p> <p>The Prudential Buildings has had a prior approval granted for change of use from office to residential. The scheme is for 72 flats. Under prior approval the Council only has control over certain aspects of the development and planning policy that would be applied under a planning application is not possible.</p>
E23	Additional green space to support new developments	Policy PA3 seeks to pursue urban greening projects, including the creation of green space within new development.
	PUBLIC	
E24	Need public transport service to it	The SCAAP sets out measures to improve the bus service in the town centre, including within the Transport, Access and Public Realm Strategy set out in Appendix 5. However, determination a detailed bus service is outside of the scope of the SCAAP. The Council would discuss potential for amended or new routes with bus operators.
E25	Any building needs to be fully accessible	Noted.
	COUNCILLOR	
E26	Dog amenity area is good	The public realm within Elmer Policy Area is accessible for all.
E27	Needs to be more published especially for outdoor events (i.e. big screen)	Noted. This is not a matter for the SCAAP but may be considered by other functions at the Council.

PA4 - Queensway Policy Area		Council Response
	PUBLIC	
Q1	Improving views across the Borough	Noted.
Q2	Wholesale regeneration of tower blocks – start again	Noted.
Q3	More greenery,, tree planting – encourage wildlife	Noted.
Q4	Provision of new open space with CCTV designed to limit anti-social behaviour	Noted, it is not proposed to include reference to CCTV within the SCAAP. This may be considered separately during the implementation stage and subsequent management

		of the properties/ public areas by other Council functions.
Q5	New housing should provide a mix of types	Noted, the mixed of housing types will be assessed against adopted policy, including the Core Strategy and Development Management Document. Policy PA4 seeks to ensure that redevelopment does not result in a net loss of affordable housing in the area.
Q6	Need accessibility of dual carriageway by foot and bike	Noted.
Q7	Public art	Noted.
Q8	Tree planting	Policy PA4 promotes urban greening in the area, which may include tree planting.
	BUSINESS	
Q9	Strong supporter of better pedestrian access here	Noted.
Q10	OS4 Queensway – strongly support plans – do it ASAP	Noted.
	COUNCILLOR	
Q11	Muli-functional open space for all	Noted.
Q12	Support open space provision, including children’s play area with play equipment and provision for ball games	Noted. Policy PA4 promotes public realm improvements, including the provision of new public open space. The specific type of open space and public facilities provided will be considered during implementation and will be subject to consultation.
Q13	Good for comprehensive re-development – move away from existing high rise	Noted, however it is considered that a range of building heights would be suitable in this location. The specific detail of the scheme, including building height, will be considered during implementation and will be subject to consultation
Q14	Public realm	Noted.
Q15	Access	Noted.
Q16	Green lung	Noted.
Q17	Create central park with good access to communities and Warrior Square Policy Area	Noted, Policy PA4 seeks to create an urban park and improve links to a number of policy areas, including Warrior Square.
	PUBLIC	
Q18	Queensway/ Sutton roundabout needs to be redeveloped to allow ‘street level’ crossing – underpasses are not elderly/ disabled friendly and so need level crossing.	Policy PA4 seeks to create an improved crossing at Queensway/ Sutton Road junction. The precise detail and layout of this will be determined during the implementation phase of the Better Queensway project, which will be subject to public consultation
Q19	Must keep under-road at Queensway	Policy PA4 seeks to improve access and permeability at various junctions along the Queensway dual carriageway. The precise layout will be determined during the implementation phase of the Better Queensway project, which will be subject to public consultation
Q20	Make more use of historic buildings – mark prominence	Policy PA4 includes provision to enhance the setting of Porters and All Saints Church. Policy DS3: Landmarks and Landmark Buildings seeks to conserve this type of building and structure.

		Policy DM5 of the Development Management Document seeks to conserve and enhance heritage assets, including listed and locally listed buildings.
Q21	No mention of community facilities, e.g. doctors, dentists, rehabilitation services	Policy PA4 supports the provision of community infrastructure, which may include facilities such as community centres, doctor and dental surgeries, and children's nurseries.
	COUNCILLOR	
Q22	Is there enough green space?	Policy PA4 includes provision for urban greening and an urban park. In addition, there is provision for the creation of green space in other areas within the SCAAP which will help provide a holistic approach to green space provision in the central area.
Q23	Provision for community hall/ buildings (mixed-use)	Policy PA4 supports the provision of community infrastructure, which may include facilities such as community centres and clubs.
	PUBLIC	
Q24	Continue to maintain Queensway dual carriage way to keep traffic flows	Noted. Policy PA4 promotes a number of access and public realm improvements. The precise layout will be considered during implementation of Better Queensway and associated projects, which will be subject to public consultation.
Q25	Safe pedestrian access, not by shared surface	Noted. The SCAAP seeks to enhance access for pedestrians and cyclists, including a 'mixed mode – shared priority' route. Any scheme will be designed and implemented in line with current best practice and appropriate guidance.
Q26	Consideration of railings to stop cars & vehicles stopping along pavement	Noted, however this level of detailed is not considered to be required in the SCAAP, but may be considered by other functions at the Council and Better Queensway.
Q27	Quality finish required and value for money	Noted.
Q28	Pedestrian crossings should be at surface level (Porters roundabout)	Noted. The SCAAP sets out guiding principles that should be addressed during development of the area. The precise layout will be considered during implementation of Better Queensway and associated projects, which will be subject to public consultation.
Q29	If cars are allowed to turn South into Chichester Road from Queensway they should not be allowed to turn right into Victoria Shopping Centre car park.	This is not a matter for the SCAAP but may be considered by other functions at the Council. Detailed traffic movements will be considered as part of wider traffic management proposals.
Q30	G.P. facilities must be maintained or improved	Noted. Policy PA4 supports the provision of community infrastructure, which may include facilities such as doctor surgeries.
Q31	Ensure road underpass remains. Filing it in would be disastrous for Thorpe Bay	Noted. Policy PA4 promotes a number of access and public realm improvements. The precise layout will be considered during implementation of Better Queensway and associated projects, which will be subject to public consultation.
Q32	Accessible services should include day centre for disabled people	Noted. Policy PA4 supports the provision of social and community infrastructure.

	BUSINESS	
Q33	Do we really need an underpass here?	Noted. Policy PA4 promotes a number of access and public realm improvements. The precise layout will be considered during implementation of Better Queensway and associated projects, which will be subject to public consultation.
Q34	The underpass needs filling in to compliment the church and porters	Noted. The precise road layout will be considered during implementation of Better Queensway and associated projects, which will be subject to public consultation. Policy PA4 seeks to enhance the setting of Porters and All Saints Church.
	COUNCILLOR	
Q35	Top of Queensway underpass should be opened up and decked (no shelters). For open air games – skateboarding/ basketball	Noted. Policy PA4 promotes a number of access and public realm improvements. The precise layout will be considered during implementation of Better Queensway and associated projects, which will be subject to public consultation.
	PUBLIC	
Q36	Better design of buildings will raise moral for local residents and promote cleanliness overall	Policy DM1 – Design Quality of the Development Management Document, supports good quality, innovative design in new development, which adds to the overall quality of an area. Repetition of this policy is not required within the SCAAP. Nevertheless, included in the Queensway Policy Area is the aim for development to be an exemplar of successful design-led estate regeneration.
Q37	Cleaning and lighting at underpass is infrequent	The SCAAP is not the appropriate document to set out lighting and cleansing arrangements for the underpass, but it may be considered by other functions at the Council.
Q38	Clearer signage for direction to Victoria station	Noted, it is proposed that reference will be included to improve legibility to aid way finding to Victoria Station from the Queensway policy area.
Q39	All pedestrian crossings should have audible signals and have tactile surfaces.	This issue and level of detail is not a matter for the SCAAP. Detailed design of road crossings will be considered at the design stage, having regard to the needs of all road users and will be implemented by other Council functions.

PA5 - Warrior Square Policy Area		Council Response
	PUBLIC	
W1	Good provision of green space	Noted.
W2	The continuation of the idea that this should be an area that coincides with conservation and preserving green landscapes	Noted.

W3	Great existing green footprint – add to this by offering something to attract people in the evening	Noted.
	BUSINESS	
W4	OS5 Warrior Square - Support the plan for redevelopment – do it ASAP	Noted.
	PUBLIC	
W5	Seating on the green space	Policy PA5: Warrior Square Policy Area Development Principles provisions seek to improve public open space and related facilities. The SCAAP does not set out the specific siting of seating or other street furniture. The specific layout of proposals will be considered during the implementation stage of schemes and be subject to consultation.
W6	Healthcare as Queensway is already over-burdened	Policy PA4: Queensway Policy Area Development Principles seeks to provide for additional/enhanced community facilities.
W7	Attractive areas for young people and the community – the green space for the park as a focal point with activities, e.g. book sales	The Policy Area provisions seek to improve public open space and related facilities. It will be for the community in conjunction with the Council to explore ways that the space can be flexibly used, if appropriate.
	PUBLIC	
W8	Prefer segregated cycle/ walking routes for safety	Noted, detailed consideration of cycle/ walking routes will be considered at implementation stage and will take account of best practice and guidance.
W9	Better link between Warrior Sq. and High Street	Policy PA5: Warrior Square Policy Area Development Principles 5b seeks to achieve this.
W10	Ensure any new development has adequate parking - either basement or high rise	All development proposals are subject to adopted car parking standards as set out in the Development Management Document.
W11	Entrance from Queensway into Whitegate Road, and Warrior Sq., should be allowed	Policy PA5: Warrior Square Policy Area Development Principles seeks to provide for a package of measures to improve connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists. Changes to the junction design or function would need to be considered by other Council functions. It is not for the SCAAP to determine.
W12	Improve character and promote use – at the moment only drunks use the area and is therefore not family friendly	Policy PA5: Warrior Square Policy Area Development Principles seeks to maintain the environmental and design quality of Warrior Square Gardens and promote future public realm improvements that respect and engage with the Gardens.
W13	Have a square in Warrior Square, rather than additional housing	<p>Opportunity Site 5 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the</p>

		Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021.
W14	Move the market to Warrior Sq or have special summer events	The SCAAP seeks to move the street market to London Road/High Street which is considered a more appropriate location as part of the future pedestrianisation scheme proposed for the area.
W15	Shared routes/ facilities – needs respect between road users parking and issues with the blind and partially sighted and deaf.	Noted, detailed consideration of cycle/walking routes will be considered at implementation stage and will take account of best practice and guidance as well as the needs of specific users.
	BUSINESS	
W16	Queensway divides the town from the East – need better pedestrian access across it	Policy PA4: Queensway Policy Area Development Principles and related provisions of the Plan seek to improve pedestrian connectivity between east and west and Queensway Dual Carriageway.
W17	More diverse use of retail to encourage people to the green areas	Policy DS1: A Prosperous Retail Centre seeks to provide for a diverse range of retail uses.
W18	Car parking needs replacing, not necessarily on this site	Adequate car parking provision in the town centre is essential to the vitality and viability of the town centre.
	COUNCILLOR	
W19	Need a better use of temporary green space – it was a former swimming pool	Policy PA5: Warrior Square Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this. However, Opportunity Site 5 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period. Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021
W20	Improve profile of the conservation area	Policy PA5: Warrior Square Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
W21	Improve natural surveillance to reduce potential for anti-social behaviour	Policy PA5: Warrior Square Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this by promoting residential development facing the square.
W22	Protect green space for sport usage – 5 aside football pitch or running track round the edge or picnic area, or a maze or a fountain	The use of the potential provision of additional green open space will be considered at the design stage.
W23	Lighting scheme to promote a safer environment, but important not to negatively impact residents	Lighting has already been improved in the square as part of the implementation of a previous regeneration scheme for the site. Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to maintain lighting provision in the Central Area.
W24	OS5 Warrior Square – can support higher density	Policy PA5: Warrior Square Policy Area Development Principles promotes development that is compatible with and respects the character and amenities of the adjacent Conservation Area. Opportunity Site 5 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before

		<p>2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the site will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021.</p>
	PUBLIC	
W25	Buildings should all be accessible for disabled people	Provision of facilities for vulnerable users would be considered at the design stage of schemes. Provisions in the Development Management Document assist with this in respect of Space Standards and the new Government National Space Standards and associated documentation.
W26	Needs area for guide dogs to do their toilet	Provision of facilities for vulnerable users would be considered at the design stage of schemes.

PA6 - Clifftown Policy Area		Council Response
	PUBLIC	
C1	Support	Noted.
C2	Good	Noted.
C3	Good	Noted.
C4	Positive approach to development with access to Eastern Esplanade	Noted.
C5	Signage to development areas	Noted. It is proposed to add reference to improved signage to Policy PA6.
C6	Good to protect views – rethink Esplanade pub redevelopment – to high and not in keeping with conservation area.	Noted. Esplanade public house has planning permission to demolish existing building, and erect a 5 storey building comprising 23 self-contained flats with ground floor restaurant and basement parking, layout amenity area, refuse and cycle storage and landscaping, form new vehicular access onto Western Esplanade.
	BUSINESS	
C7	OS16 & OS17 – agree with redevelopment of car parks as described, but need provision for replacement parking	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
	COUNCILLOR	
C8	Redevelop Empire Theatre	Policy PA6: Clifftown Policy Area Development Principles seek to regenerate the site of the Empire Theatre.
	PUBLIC	
C9	Motorcycle parking – where is it going to be re-provided?	It is considered that reference to a range of parking types, including for motorcycle's, should be made within Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm and it is proposed that the SCAAP will be updated to reflect this.
C10	Make more of the cinema	Policy PA6: Clifftown Policy Area Development Principles seeks to regenerate the site of the Empire Theatre.
C11	Potential area of cliff slip, which needs to be addressed	Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Site 9 seeks to achieve this with the initial work carried out on the development of a new museum. Policy DM14 of the Development Management Document sets out policy regarding land instability.
C12	Concerned that plans for a public square will take away bus stops and parking for disabled people near shops	Plans to regenerate the forecourt of the Central Railway Station will take into account the provision of bus stops to provide an interchange, and the needs of vulnerable road users at the design stage.

	COUNCILLOR	
C13	Make sure a multi storey car park is provided on Tylers, before other car parks are developed	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Site 6 seeks to address the need for replacement car parking provision.
C14	Improve derelict Royal Terrace properties	Policy PA6: Clifftown Policy Area Development Principles seeks to improve and enhance the townscape of the Conservation Area.
C15	More trees and landscaping near car parks	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm 2d. seeks to achieve this.
	PUBLIC	
C16	Area of anti-social behaviour – need better public space	Policy PA6: Clifftown Policy Area Development Principles seeks to improve the public open spaces within the area.
C17	Bring back the bandstand & tea room on the green	Such a proposal may be considered investigated as part of future proposals for the area.
C18	Suggest we should protect front doors + consider listing front elevation of Clifftown Area, with respect to boiler flues etc	The conservation of buildings is subject to strict controls under planning laws and supplemented by the Policy for the specific Policy Area and other planning policy documents.
C19	Reinstate some of the street furniture around the bowling green & surrounding roads	Policy PA6: Clifftown Policy Area Development Principles seeks to provide for public realm improvements, including street furniture, in the area.
C20	Encourage bakers, butchers, florists in Alexandra St.	Policy DS1: Maintaining a Prosperous Retail Centre seeks to provide for a mix of retail units in the centre.
C21	Empire Theatre, potential for it to become developed like Clements Arcade in Leigh-on-Sea	Policy PA6: Clifftown Policy Area Development Principles seeks to regenerate the site of the Empire Theatre with uses that contribute to the Policy Area's aim.
C22	Southend Central forecourt – needs to have a taxi rank on both sides and facilities going in both directions	Taxi rank facilities are regularly reviewed as part of wider traffic management measures. Locations for proposed and existing taxi ranks are shown on the Policies Map. The SCAAP also highlights the need for appropriate lighting around taxi ranks and parking for taxis.
C23	Empire theatre development should be accessible & have a bus route	Policy PA6: Clifftown Policy Area Development Principles seeks to regenerate the site of the Empire Theatre with uses that contribute to the Policy Area's aim.
C24	Alexandra and Clarence Car Parks – if they go other public spaces should be provided not just for residents	<p>Noted. Policy PA5: Clifftown Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this. However, Opportunity Site 16 & 17 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the sites will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the sites will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021.</p> <p>The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car</p>

		parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
	COUNCILLOR	
C25	Improve healthy opportunities such as, walking circuits, new public square	Policy PA6: Clifftown Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
C26	OS16 & OS17 – should be in the plan pre-2021	<p>Opportunity Sites 16 & 17 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the sites will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the sites will be considered during preparation of the Southend Local Plan, which will consider the delivery of sites post 2021.</p>
C27	Phase car park release to see how they come forward and if they are a success	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
	PUBLIC	
C28	More motorcycle bays	It is considered that reference to a range of parking types, including for motorcycle's, should be made within Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm.
C29	Royal Mews onto Alexandra Street should be right turn only	Detailed road improvements will be considered as part of wider traffic management proposals and are not a specific matter for the SCAAP to address.
C30	No coach parking or dropping off on Clifton Parade for purposes of the proposed museum	<p>Detailed road improvements will be considered as part of the detailed design stage of the new museum and wider traffic management proposals. However Policy CS1.13.3 outlines that the design of new development will need to retain the 'open feel' of the area. Policy DM1 of the Development Management Document and the Design and Townscape Guide provides additional design related guidance. In addition, the conservation area designation will be a material consideration.</p> <p>It is recognised that the policy can be further enhanced by outlining that vehicular access of a new development in this location should be via Western Esplanade.</p>

PA7 - Tylers Policy Area		Council Response
	PUBLIC	
T1	More trees	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
T2	Support relocation of bus station, with commercial and car parking	Noted.
T3	Create a central bus station for all buses & for coaches to encourage tourism	Noted.
T4	Support the enhancement of bus station, wider stops & routes in the SCAAP area	Noted.
T5	Support the relocation of travel centre, with commercial, cafes & residential above – independent shops	Noted.
T6	Older Peoples Assembly welcome the relocation of the travel centre, but please ensure it is user friendly and a safe environment	Noted.
T7	Support relocation of Bus Station & shops fronting York road	Noted.
T8	Support development of OS6	Noted.
T9	Welcome consideration of better access for pedestrians from town centre to seafront via Chancellor Road	Noted.
T10	Support public realm improvements of Tylers Policy Area	Noted.
	BUSINESS	
T11	Tylers is well located and used & needs stacking up to re-provide for other lost car parks	Noted. Tylers Avenue Opportunity Site includes reference for addressing replacement parking. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
T12	OS6 Tylers- agree with plans – do it ASAP	Noted.
T13	Support the redevelopment to create a circuit with Town Centre	Noted.
T14	The bus station works well for me	Noted.
	COUNCILLOR	
T15	Support relocation of bus station + decked parking, look to also provide retail if possible	Noted. Tylers Avenue Opportunity Site includes reference for addressing replacement parking and the provision of retail at ground floor. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.

T16	OS6 – support development if there are clear benefits to the local community	Noted.
	PUBLIC	
T17	Increase in housing will require additional doctors, dentists and school places	The SCAAP recognises this and makes appropriate provision for community facilities as part of development, where required.
T18	Regarding the proposals for a new cinema on Seaways and a new travel centre – there is no provision for a safe route between the two for pedestrians	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles 4d seeks to achieve this.
T19	More trees, parks and landscaping	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles 4e seeks to achieve this.
	BUSINESS	
T20	OS6 Tylers – needs to provide replacement number of parking and whatever the development yields	Noted. Tylers Avenue Opportunity Site includes reference for addressing replacement parking. Development proposals will have regard to the parking standards set out in the Development Management Document. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
	PUBLIC	
T21	Shared space would not be welcome by the elderly nor would we want to see further introduction of cycle + pedestrians sharing space	Noted. Detailed consideration of mixed-mode pedestrian and cycle routes will be considered at implementation stage and will take account of best practice and guidance.
T22	Do not like using existing travel centre, and new one will need to be welcoming and focussed around a square	Noted.
T23	Provide more trees and landscaping	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles 4e seeks to achieve this.
T24	Seating uncomfortable and metal does not work	The provision of seating would be considered at the design stage, having regard to the Southend Streetscape Manual SPD.
T25	Improve bus station with green area, trees, landscaping and sitting areas with cycle parking	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
T26	Turn the area where the existing travel centre is into green space, with trees to encourage footfall between OS6 & High Street	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles includes reference to the potential relocation of the travel centre, and green space provision and tree planting would be considered as part of any development on the former site. However, the detailed layout of a scheme will be considered and consulted upon at the design stage.
T27	Replace existing bus station as it does not work well. Reprovide on OS6 with multi-storey parking behind	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles include reference to the potential relocation of the travel centre and Tylers Avenue Opportunity Site includes reference for addressing replacement parking. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car

		parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
T28	Separate cyclists and pedestrians	Noted. Detailed consideration of mixed-mode pedestrian and cycle routes will be considered at implementation stage and will take account of best practice and guidance to ensure the needs of all users are met.
T29	Improve bus access to all routes	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to improve traffic accessibility including appropriate provision for public transport. Bus routes are considered as part of partnership working with bus operators.
T30	Travel centre is in a good location as it is close to shops, but should be redesigned so it is all undercover	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Site 6 makes provision for the potential relocation of the bus station in the interests of providing improved facilities.
	BUSINESS	
T31	OS6 Tylers - if redeveloped where will the existing parking be re-provided?	<p>Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Site 6 outlines that development of the area should address replacement car parking provision, identifying how any displaced parking needs are to be met on the site or in this part of the town centre.</p> <p>The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
T32	Need to be clear on what we want to arrive at Queensway / York Road junction	Detailed access arrangements will be considered at the design and implementation stage in association with the Council's Local Transport Plan and wider transport management services.
	COUNCILLOR	
T33	Tree planting and home zoning for Baltic/ Quebec/ Heygate/ Portland & York Rd or resident parking	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles 4c. seeks to achieve this.
T34	Proper travel centre facilities relocated to OS6 Tylers. Bus pick up points on Chancellor Rd are too short and not fit for purpose.	Noted. Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles include reference to the potential relocation of the travel centre. Bus pick-up points would be considered at the design stage of any relocation proposals.
	BUSINESS	
T35	Single access onto Queensway and low level housing with better access needed	Noted. Detailed traffic measures will be considered as part of wider traffic management proposals.

CS1 - Central Seafront Policy Area		Council Response
	PUBLIC	
CS1	City Beach looks great – extend it further	Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
CS2	City Beach phase 2 east of Marine Parade	Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
CS3	Redevelopment of cliff face	Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this in Opportunity Site 9 New Southend Museum.
CS4	OS8 Seaway Cinema	Noted.
CS5	OS8 Seaways – Regeneration is supported	Noted.
CS6	Delivery of a Lido	Noted.
CS7	Any regeneration is welcome	Noted.
CS8	Water fountains	Noted.
CS9	Cliff lift	Noted.
CS10	City Beach lighting columns	Noted.
CS11	Marine Plaza will uplift end of seafront – deliver ASAP	Noted.
CS12	Spanish steps creating better links	Noted.
	BUSINESS	
CS13	OS8 Seaways could be benefit of adjacent area – e.g. High Street/ Royals	Noted.
CS14	OS8 Seaways can provide more restaurant development	Noted.
CS15	OS8 Seaways – support opening up the site and punching through to the seafront and creating views of the seafront	Noted.
CS16	Better connect Seafront and High Street	Noted.
CS17	Pier good for tourists and should be looked after and well maintained	Noted.
CS18	Need to provide more quality hotels with conference centres – linked to Southend Airport	The Plan seeks to achieve this.
CS19	Lights and statues be incorporated in public spaces	The Plan seeks to achieve this.
	COUNCILLOR	
CS20	Museum car park	Noted
	PUBLIC	
CS21	Parking infrastructure not addressed. This area needs to be looked at to drive tourism and business. If people cannot park they will not come	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.

CS22	Marine Parade from Kursaal going west is devoid of transport links	Noted. The provision of future bus routes will be reviewed in partnership with bus operators. Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm provides for a range of transport and access improvements.
CS23	Consideration for the residents	Noted.
CS24	Residents permit parking	Residents permit parking schemes are reviewed as part of wider traffic management measures.
CS25	Residents parking in summer months	Residents parking schemes are reviewed as part of wider traffic management measures.
	BUSINESS	
CS26	OS8 Seaways should be the prime parking in the central area – Proposed development would need 1500 parking spaces linked to DM15	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS27	OS8 Seaways – parking should be free after 6pm	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS28	OS8 Seaways – only 11 coach spaces being provided, 30 spaces are required	Noted. Reference to Seaways coach drop off and parking provision included within CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles. The precise quantum of coach spaces will be decided at the design and implementation stage of the development.
CS29	OS8 Seaways – Toilets being removed, which everyone needs after 2 hour journey	Noted. Toilets and related facilities will be considered at the design stage of any redevelopment scheme.
CS30	OS8 Seaways – at least 1000+ parking spaces needed to give the new development a fighting chance with existing business	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS31	OS9 Museum – not a good idea, why not create something similar to a bandstand here	Such a proposal could possibly be investigated as part of the proposals to provide for a new museum (OS9).
CS32	More parking on City Beach	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS33	Car parking is not sufficient. Should be at least 3 times current spaces.	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in

		the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS34	Car parking spaces – want to see council data from their car parks to confirm they are not at capacity in peak times	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS35	Shelter for disabled and elderly to sit (sun shelters)	Noted. Such facilities will be considered at the design stage of any redevelopment scheme.
CS36	Something needs to be put at the end of the pier to give tourists a good experience	Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Site 7 seeks to achieve this.
	COUNCILLOR	
CS37	No taxi space/ bay on seafront	Transport, Access and Public Realm Strategy (Appendix 5), seeks to improve the provision of taxis at key locations throughout the Central Area. The Policies Map identifies a new taxi rank on Eastern Esplanade. Further reference to the provision of taxis is to be included to Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm and CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles.
	PUBLIC	
CS38	OS8 Seaways – can more parking be created through layout + extra floors of multi-storey	Noted. The detailed layout of the scheme will be considered and consulted upon during the design and implementation stage. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS39	OS8 Seaways – against development unless better access roads are provided + measures against congestion	Policy seeks to achieve this, including policies CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles and DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm.
CS39	OS8 Seaways – any development should incorporate houses/ low rise fronting Herbert Grove	Opportunity Site 8 seeks to encourage residential development as part of a mixed use scheme. Any design matters would be addressed at a detailed planning application stage.
CS40	OS8 Seaways – include multi-storey + retail and leisure	Opportunity Site 8 seeks to provide for leisure, cultural and tourism facilities. Further reference will be made to the re-provision of parking. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS41	OS8 Seaways – Cinema not needed	A cinema is considered to be an appropriate use in this locality. It will be for a developer to determine whether it is a viable enterprise.

CS42	OS7 Pier –should be free and more uses should be created, including rides, restaurants, pubs, boat trips, make better use of cultural centre	Opportunity Site 7 seeks to achieve a mix of cultural and leisure uses on the Pier.
CS43	OS7 Pier – more at the end needed	Opportunity Site 7 seeks to achieve a mix of cultural and leisure uses on the Pier.
CS44	OS7 Pier – ample opportunity to make more fun/ interesting place to visit. Amenities needed along its length and at the end	Opportunity Site 7 seeks to achieve a mix of cultural and leisure uses on the Pier.
CS45	OS7 Pier to long and more attractions required	Opportunity Site 7 seeks to achieve a mix of cultural and leisure uses on the Pier.
CS46	OS7 Pier – should be free to walk on and have more facilities	Charging regimes are reviewed as part of the wider tourism strategy for the Borough. It is not for the SCAAP to address this matter.
CS47	The vision for the Policy Area seems vague	The aims are considered to be clear in their objectives and appropriate for this prime leisure and tourism area.
CS48	The Marine Parade to Chancellor Road walk way doesn't offer a good link into the town centre – need to accommodate this and public transport	Policy PA7 seeks to achieve this.
CS49	Can Marine Parade be traffic free – pedestrians only	Marine Parade is a key traffic route and provides 'shared space' for users.
CS50	Drainage & flood protection	Policy DS4: Flood Risk Management and Sustainable Drainage provides appropriate policy on this issue.
CS51	Shared space a disaster – pedestrianise	Marine Parade is a key traffic route and provides 'shared space' for users.
CS52	Install another fountain	This will be considered as part of wider regeneration proposals.
CS53	More green space – this does not seem to have been considered	This is considered throughout the Plans provisions.
CS54	Use the Kursaal as an exhibition centre for the saxon king/ London wreck	Opportunity Site 9: the new Southend Museum seeks to provide for such a facility.
CS55	Setup a tram system along the seafront	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to improve public transport. Innovative schemes such as tram provision would be considered as part of wider traffic management proposals having regard to economic feasibility.
CS56	Join up the seafront	Noted.
CS57	Refuse collection and general upkeep, including road surfaces and pathways, street lighting	This is not a direct matter for the SCAAP. Refuse collection is considered as part of the Borough Council's service provision whilst road servicing funding forms part of the Local Transport Plan provisions.
CS58	The pier lift is usually broken or at least one of them	This is not a direct matter for the SCAAP. Maintenance issues are considered as part of the Borough Council's service provision.
CS59	Flood risk was in the 2010 plan for the seafront and yet shared space allowed water to run into businesses. Therefore, no more shared space and improve drains.	Policy DS4: Flood Risk Management and Sustainable Drainage provides appropriate policy.
CS60	Summer bus routes along the seafront – regular service	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to improve traffic accessibility including appropriate provision for public transport. Bus routes are considered as part of partnership working with bus operators.
CS61	Drainage systems need improving	Policy DS4: Flood Risk Management and Sustainable Drainage provides appropriate

		policy.
	BUSINESS	
CS62	OS8 Seaways – Any development should provide as much parking as there already	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS63	OS9 Museum – get on a provide the additional parking	Noted. Opportunity Site 9 the New Southend Museum makes provision for public car parking.
CS64	How will the car parking study and survey capture the additional capacity in the road?	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS65	Need more car parking, residential development and A3 restaurants	The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP. The Plan seeks to achieve more residential development together with A3 uses.
CS66	Significant improvements to the transport infrastructure	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm in combination with other Council initiatives seeks to achieve this.
CS67	Transport network cannot cope	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to achieve appropriate improvements to the transport network.
CS68	Replace dedicated cycle lane with parking	Cycle lanes are an integral part of the transport strategy for improving sustainable transport links in line with national planning policy.
CS69	Make more accident proof with the cycle lane	This is not a direct matter for the SCAAP to address. Safety issues are considered as part of wider on-going traffic management proposals.
CS70	Replace existing parking with chevron parking along the Esplanade	This is not a direct matter for the SCAAP to address. Parking provision design is reviewed periodically as part of wider traffic management proposals.
CS71	Get on and develop	Noted.
CS72	Full bus service along the seafront – Thorpe Bay to Chalkwell	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to improve traffic accessibility including appropriate provision for public transport.
CS73	Traffic flow and congestion signage	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm provides for such issues.
CS74	Pedestrianisation of Pier Hill, creating an open area with designer lighting	Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles seeks to regenerate the seafront areas including the provision of Phase 2 of the City Beach scheme.
CS75	Need to improve access to sea front from the bus station and between High Street and Seafront.	Policies PA7 and CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles seek to achieve this.

	COUNCILLOR	
CS76	Positive about new development but it must provide parking provision for residents and commercial need	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS77	City Beach Phase 2 – replacement of the car parking within the same area	Noted. Detailed consideration of the scheme will be considered and consulted upon during the design stage. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS78	Creative uplighting and more trees	Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
CS79	Ensure coach parking provision is maintained in the Central Seafront area	Noted. Additional wording is proposed to Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles OS8 to take into account coach parking.
CS80	OS7 Pier – creative lighting scheme for the pier	Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Site 7 seeks to achieve appropriate improvements to the Pier, including the provision of creative lighting. Development Principles for the central seafront area also includes provision for creative lighting.
	PUBLIC	
CS81	Cost of parking during the day is expensive. Basildon and Lakeside is free	Car parking charges are reviewed as part of wider traffic management proposals. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS82	Bigger and more bins outside cafes and Wimpy.	Refuse collection is considered as part of the Borough Council's service provision and is not a direct matter for the SCAAP to address.
CS83	With new buildings taking car parking where will they go? Approx 6 million trippers over the summer period.	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
CS84	Individual rubbish bins for each house will mean less bags on the streets	Refuse collection is considered as part of the Borough Council's service provision and is not a direct matter for the SCAAP to address.
CS85	Street furniture – replace 'Black Balls' with posts at Hartington Road	Specific elements of street furniture would be considered at the design stage of any scheme in accordance with the Council's adopted Streetscape Manual SPD3.
CS86	City Beach shared space needs to be re-designated with proper pavements	This is not a direct matter for the SCAAP to address. Safety issues are considered as

	and audible crossings – current crossings are not legal	part of wider on-going traffic management and maintenance proposals.
CS87	Bus service from OS8, via Kursaal, to Chalkwell required	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to improve traffic accessibility including appropriate provision for public transport. Bus routes are considered as part of partnership working with bus operators.
CS88	OS9 – needs a proper bus service and segregated cycle/ pedestrian routes	Such issues will be considered at the detailed design stage.
	BUSINESS	
CS89	Coach & car parking for conference facilities	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP. The museum development provides for conference facilities with additional parking.

PA8 - Victoria Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area		Council Response
	PUBLIC	Noted.
V1	Support aims of the conservation area preserving important buildings	Noted.
V2	Support secondary frontage on West Street – should not be turned into housing	Noted.
V3	OS11- Support residential development on existing empty office blocks, but do not build on car parks on Baxter Avenue	Noted.
V4	OS11 – Support open space at Victoria Avenue. Also need CCTV to limit anti-social behaviour	Noted.
V5	Development good standards of design for buildings	Policy PA8: Victoria Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this in combination with other adopted planning policy, notably Policy DM1 – Design Quality of the Development Management Document.
V6	Making the area more aesthetically pleasing	Policy PA8: Victoria Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
V7	Enticing businesses	Business promotion is pursued under wider economic development proposals.
V8	BUSINESS	
V9	Re-development of Vic Avenue office blocks	Policy PA8: Victoria Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.

	PUBLIC	
V10	Churchill Gardens feels unsafe to walk through – improvements may uplift area and make it feel safer	Improvements to existing public parks are considered as part of wider parks serving and maintenance provision.
V11	Artist workspaces – to attract arty people to the area	Reference to cultural faculties, which could include artist workspace is included in the policy.
V12	Need healthcare, dentists, schools and jobs for residents	Policy PA8: Victoria Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this within the Policy Area or as part of the wider SCAAP regeneration.
V13	Protect Edwardian homes and other buildings of merit	The Plan seeks to protect and enhance the areas Conservation Areas, listed and locally listed buildings and other heritage assets.
V14	Need care of the street scene	Policy PA8: Victoria Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this together with the Council's Streetscape Manual SPD3.
V15	More trees, everywhere and landscaping	Policy PA8: Victoria Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
V16	Very few public toilets are accessible	Noted. Toilets and related facilities will be considered at the design stage of any redevelopment scheme.
	PUBLIC	
V17	Demolish concrete bridge between Vic station and Vic Shopping Centre	This provides access to and as such is considered to be an integral part of the Victorias shopping centre.
V18	Lack of open and green space, improve landscaping	Policy PA8 seeks to achieve improved 'urban greening' in the area.
V19	OS13 – keep football club at Roots Hall and improve overall offer	The Football Club have long-term proposals to relocate to Fossetts Farm. The Core Strategy supports the relocation of the Football Club. However, Opportunity Site 13 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.
V20	OS13 – current location is a sustainable location for football stadium	The Football Club have long-term proposals to relocate to Fossetts Farm. The Core Strategy supports the relocation of the Football Club. However, Opportunity Site 13 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.
V21	OS13 – redevelop football stadium where it is	The Football Club have long-term proposals to relocate to Fossetts Farm. The Core Strategy supports the relocation of the Football Club. However, Opportunity Site 13 will not be included in the final version of the SCAAP as there is insufficient evidence that the site will come forward before 2021, the end of the SCAAP's plan period.
V22	OS11 – if residential where will the cars be located and stored	Car parking provision will be considered at the design stage in accordance with adopted car parking standards in the Development Management Document.
V23	Need to ensure good quality design of buildings that is distinctive to Vic.	Policy PA8 seeks to achieve this.

	Avenue	
V24	Churchill gardens are sub-standard – need action now.	Improvements to existing public parks are considered as part of wider parks servicing and maintenance provision.
V25	Need to create a more visible link to the High Street – currently there is no view of it from Vic. Avenue.	It is proposed that further wording is incorporated into Policy PA2: London Road Policy Area Development Principles related to improving legibility and pedestrian access, alongside improvements to the public realm.
V26	Beecroft Art Gallery could be made higher profile. A wonderful asset to the town but poor advertising and publicity.	Such provision is considered as part of the Council's wider cultural strategy.
V27	Museum could be made higher profile and could be a strong cultural asset to the town	Noted.
V28	Ensure good access to development so that it doesn't affect Vic. Avenue – and ensure adequate parking.	Noted. Car parking and access provision will be considered at the design stage in accordance with the Development Management Document and Core Strategy.
V29	Improve pedestrian access into the High Street from Victoria area.	It is proposed that further wording is incorporated into Policy PA2: London Road Policy Area Development Principles related to improving legibility and pedestrian access, alongside improvements to the public realm.
V30	Pedestrians and cyclists should be separated, not shared facilities	Noted. Detailed consideration of mixed-mode pedestrian and cycle routes will be undertaken at implementation stage and will take account of best practice and guidance.
V31	Don't want tables and chairs in public spaces, unless there is a 3ft barrier around them	Noted. This is covered by licensing policy and the associated department at the Council.
V32	Offices need to be accessible	Noted.
	BUSINESS	
V33	Connectivity to the Town Centre	It is proposed that further wording is incorporated into Policy PA2: London Road Policy Area Development Principles related to improving legibility and pedestrian access, alongside improvements to the public realm.
V34	Urgent that PA8.1 Heath and Carby and PA8.8 Victoria House are redeveloped	Noted.
V35	Walking access from rail station for people with luggage	The Victoria Gateway junction improvements have greatly enhanced and improved pedestrian linkages to the town centre.
V36	Public space needs to be more active and animated, including Vic. Circus	Policy PA1: High Street Policy Area Development Principles and PA2: London Road Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
V37	Better signage to High Street and Seafront	It is proposed that further wording is incorporated into Policy PA2: London Road Policy Area Development Principles related to improving legibility and pedestrian access, alongside improvements to the public realm.
	COUNCILLOR	
V38	Potential for use in this area	Noted.

V39	Zoning of car parking in the town centre	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
V40	Potential for a viaduct at this junction	Noted.
	PUBLIC	
V41	When museum is relocated to cliffs, what will happen to the existing one?	The building will be preserved and its setting enhanced as part of Policy in the SCAAP. This matter for Council's wider cultural strategy provisions rather than directly related to the SCAAP.
V42	Bus service should be accessible and reliable and available evenings and weekends	Bus services and routes are reviewed as part of partnership working with the bus operators.
V43	BUSINESS	
V44	Free parking after 6pm	Car parking charges/regime are reviewed as part of the Council's wider traffic management proposals. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
V45	Road signage for airport from Southend Central	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to improve road signage.
V46	Traffic flows and way finding and issue with parking costs	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to improve traffic management /road signage. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
	COUNCILLOR	
V47	Timings on traffic lights can be problematic	Traffic timings on traffic lights are reviewed as part of wider traffic management proposals.

PA9 - Sutton Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area		Council Response
	COUNCILLOR	
S1	Agree with brownfield sites being developed first	Noted.

S2	OS12 – support more housing – flats and apartments to create density	Noted.
	PUBLIC	
S3	Total lack of planning for floods – no more shared space	Policy DS4: Flood Risk Management and Sustainable Drainage provides for appropriate measures for flood risk management and sustainable drainage.
S4	Need to ensure cycle land is appropriate for the road size – dedicated doesn't work everywhere	Noted.
S5	Keep the area as commercial not residential	Policy PA9: Sutton Road Policy Area Development Principles seeks to maintain and promote Grainger Road and Short Street as employment growth areas. It is considered that there are planning merits of allowing a number of existing employment uses along Sutton Road to be redeveloped for additional housing, as evidenced by the Employment Land Review supporting document.
S6	Separate pedestrian and cycle routes and better paths	Noted, detailed consideration of pedestrian and cycle routes will be considered at implementation stage and will take account of best practice and guidance.
S7	Public toilets needed	Noted. Toilets and related facilities will be considered at the design stage of any redevelopment scheme.
	COUNCILLOR	
S8	OS14 – consider height of new residential, too high may affect existing residents	The height of buildings will be considered at the design stage of any development scheme. Policy DM4 of the Development Management Document sets out the Council's approach for managing tall and large buildings.
S9	Open up access to short street	Policy PA9: Sutton Road Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve an enhanced pedestrian/cycle route along Short Street.
S10	Improve aspects of the public realm. Ensure connectivity with other areas with good highway and pedestrian links.	Policy PA9: Sutton Road Policy Area Development Principles and other related aspects of the Plan seek to achieve this.
S11	Open space for all ages, including ball games etc	Noted.
S12	Include children's play area	Recreation provision within open spaces and parks is considered at the design stage of new proposals and reviewed as appropriate part of the Council's wider recreation provision.
S13	Please consider existing residents – houses not flats	The Plan seeks to achieve a variety of residential development and tenures appropriate to its location and setting to meet housing needs in lined with local policy. Policy DM7 of the Development Management Document sets out the Council's approach regarding dwelling mix, size and type.

Overall or other Issues		Council Response
	All Sites – Support regeneration of sites – caveats maintain parking, provide	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car

parking for development, increases legibility, enhances public realm, provides more critical mass	parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
Residents Parking in Milton Place	This is not a direct matter for the SCAAP to address. Residents Parking Schemes are reviewed as part of wider traffic management proposals.
More trees everywhere	The Plan seeks to provide for improved landscaping, tree planting and 'urban greening' as appropriate.
Vision statement should include opportunity sites (6,3,4,11,8 etc.) Policy Area black lines are unhelpful in this sense (Overall – Map 2)	The vision is an overarching aim and it is not appropriate to refer to specific opportunity sites.
Where are the toilets?	Noted. This is not a direct matter for the SCAAP to address .Toilets and related facilities will be considered at the design stage of any redevelopment scheme.
Concerned about the context – need to explain clearly how all the proposals inter-relate and their impact on traffic movements and car parking	It is considered that the Plan and the Policies Map clearly explains its context and how its policy provisions interrelate.
Support the provision of more social housing. People are being priced out of the area	Noted. The adopted Core Strategy provides provision for affordable housing.
Essential to get the document in place to make BIDs for government funding for transport and infrastructure improvements	Noted.
Ensuring long term use of retail spaces to be creative. If empty then fill them with smaller units in a market style, like Stratford has in the old shopping centre	Noted.
A large retail anchor is needed with lots of quality small units	Policy DS1: A Prosperous Retail Centre seeks to improve the retail offer in the town centre.
Please consider safer parking schemes	Safety is an integral consideration in the design of any road scheme.
Council needs to be pro-active to stop vehicles parking on the pavement	The Council actively pursues traffic enforcement.
Elmer Sq. project funds in Council budget 2016/17 – what impact does this have	The Implementation Section Tables will be updated including details of any allocated funding. Elmer Square phase 2 is outlined in PA3: Elmer Square Policy Area Development Principles.
Improve legibility in the town centre, advertise where shops are (for pedestrians and vehicle users)	Noted. The Plan and wider tourism publicity seeks to achieve this.
Further taxi ranks to help the elderly and disabled and more blue badge spaces	Noted. Taxi rank and disabled parking provision is considered as part of wider traffic management proposals for the town and location of proposed and existing are shown on the Policies Map.
Insufficient road infrastructure coming into the town is killing business and events	The Council is actively seeking to improve road accessibility into the town through its Local Transport Plan provisions and partnership working/bidding for appropriate funding

		for infrastructure improvements.
	Any undercroft parking must be safe and useable	Noted.
	Car parking desperately needs to be considered in more detailed and a balance achieved	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
	All policy areas should maintain green, open and public space and create new ones	The Plan actively seeks to achieve this.
	Cost of car parking is too high – differentiated parking costs need to be reasonable	Car parking charges are considered as part of wider traffic management proposals. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
	Maintaining & improving the East-West transport & access through the SCAAP area	The Plan seeks to achieve this.
	Parking spaces in the height of season is a major problem	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
	Create a forum or lists of contacts for professionals with similar interests to come together	The Council actively promotes a Business Partnership and other partnership working.
	Complaints from customers staff attitude at the pier museum	Noted.
	Spending money on the library car park won't assist town centre & central seafront	Noted. Car parks repairs and management are considered as part of wider traffic management proposals.
	Issue of cliff slip at former yacht club	Noted. Policy DM14 of the Development Management Document sets out the approach for managing development close to land instability.
	Create links between vacant parking and transport in town	The Plan actively seeks to improve connectivity. The VSM system outlined in the SCAAP will assist this and part of the Transport, Access and Public Realm Strategy.
	Throughout the document the importance of public toilets, accessibility and outdoor seating should be made	Toilets and related facilities will be considered at the design stage of any redevelopment scheme.
	Bus stops need to be located closer to shops	Bus stops and routes are considered in partnership with the bus operators.
	Encourage more industrial space in the Borough for industry and pharmaceutical science-based firms	The Plan seeks to improve employment provision within the Central Area. New employment space is also being created at the new airport business park.
	Improved signage for heavy vehicles	The Plan seeks to achieve this in Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm

More public art everywhere! "Leake Street" in London Waterloo	The Plan seeks to achieve this.
Do not signpost new stadium and in particular retail/cinema/town centre uses – being built outside the SCAAP area i.e. Fossetts Farm would result in further decline of Prittlewell and town centre	Noted. Any development proposed as Fossetts Farm that included retail development would need to provide an impact assessment if over the qualifying threshold.
How does this differ from the "Renaissance project"??	The Masterplan for the Central Area has been incorporated into the development of the SCAAP. The SCAAP will be a Council planning policy document which will include proposals for development as well as guide any prospective planning applications.
Is the plan for Victoria Avenue to knock down the existing buildings? Or Renovate	A mixed use residential led scheme is proposed in Policy PA8: Victoria Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area Development Principles. It plans for comprehensive redevelopment but there may be some retention of existing buildings owing to the new Government Prior Approval process.
Improvement to the bus station to allow easier access	Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles seeks to achieve this.
No mention of people anywhere – effect of vision on all ages should be stated	The Plan is designed to be fully inclusive of all persons.
Street lighting – improve above standard regulations – make street feel safe and encourage people walking	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to maintain an appropriate level of street lighting.
Public transport needs serious improvements. Currently very poor and bus companies need to work together /co-ordinate.	Policy DS5: Transport, Access and Public Realm seeks to provide for improved sustainable transport provision. The Council works in partnership with bus operators with the objective of improving facilities.
Loss of parking facilities could cause problems. Please consider distance, disabled management of all car parks, public transport and coach drop off zones	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
Stronger links to transport improvements around the Borough	The Plan seeks to improve connectivity.
Maintain and enhance Southchurch Road and Woodgrange Drive	Policies PA4: Queensway Policy Area Development Principles and Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles seek to achieve this.
Advertising transport links to the Hospital Clearly, Shuttle bus service from town centre to hospital	The Hospital is outside the SCAAP area. The SCAAP seeks to improve and enhance public transport and signage.
Will the roads from the east of the borough be affected by the proposals including the construction phase?	Proposals will not affect east/west links by road.
All these potential developments of the High Street and environs would be negatively affected by the threatened environmentally destructive development of Fossetts Farm which as Basildon Council leader said with reference to the effects of out of town "retail parks" have had on his area "suck the life out of the town centre". Build up the High Street , seafront etc. Government leave the Fossetts Farm Green Belt alone!	The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundaries. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study). Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy and require a retail impact assessment.

Graffiti at first and second floor on high street and on the new bridge – can BID do something about it?	The Council actively pursues a programme of removing graffiti. It is something that the BID may be able to address.
Site 10 Woodgrange Estate will require full input on BREEAM and Secure by Design	Noted.
Summer holiday park and ride outside town	Park and Ride schemes have been considered a number of times in recent years but have not been considered feasible given the limited land available and linear peninsula geography of the town. Even so, the provision of Park and Ride would only be feasible outside the SCAAP boundaries. Such options will be kept under review as part of the Local Transport Plan and development of the Southend Local Plan.
Provision of motorcycle parking with shelter and secure	<p>The SCAAP seeks to promote a positive approach to public car parking provision that provides public car parking levels that support the vitality of the town centre and access to the seafront by encouraging improvements to the quality of access to parking so that it is convenient, well-signposted, safe and secure.</p> <p>It is considered that reference to a range of parking types, including for motorcycle's, should be made within Policy DS5.</p> <p>The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.</p>
All areas – car parking is a key issue, need to provide enough parking for new development and public spaces	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
How will the proposed Fossetts Farm Retail Development affect this, Is there room for both?	The Fossetts Farm proposals are located outside the SCAAP boundaries. Planning permission for retail development at Fossetts Farm has been previously granted and its potential impact taken into consideration in the preparation of the Core Strategy and SCAAP (see also Southend Retail Study). Any new proposal at Fossetts Farm will require planning permission, be subject to planning policy and require a retail impact assessment.
Parking development on seafront needed	Noted. The approach to car park management will be informed by an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP.
Better connected roads around the town, too much one way or disconnected	Policy DS5: seeks to improve traffic management in the Central Area.

	from one another	
	What is the scope for additional new development outside of the main town/urban area?	This is an issue for the new Local Plan.
	Making spaces available for community projects/group (such as empty shops/buildings)	<p>A number of policy areas seek to promote the provision of social and community infrastructure. Policy DS1 seeks to encourage the landowner/landlord to display local art within the windows of empty shops to create visual interest from the public realm.</p> <p>Reference to marketing will be included for vacant units. In respect to Policy DS1 vacant units could include units occupied for temporary or 'flexible' uses, permitted through a temporary planning permission or under permitted development rights.</p>

Appendix 5: Summary of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (December 2015)

- 7.1 The following paragraphs provide a summary of the Sustainability Appraisal comments made to each issue raised in the Southend Central Area Action Plan Preferred Approach (December 2015).

TO BE INSERTED – Please Refer to Sustainability Appraisal