

Tendring *District Council*



Independent Examination of Section 2 of the Tendring District Local Plan '2013-2033 and Beyond'

HEARING STATEMENT FROM THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Matter 6: Living Places and Design

January 2021

Matter 6 – Living Places and Design

6.1 Sustainable Design (SPL3)

Are the criteria in SPL3 justified and consistent with national policy? Are the requirements of the policy reasonable and clearly articulated and would the policy be effective?

Do the requirements of part B (a) reflect the guidance in paragraph 32 of the Framework? Are the requirements of Part B (d) reasonable and in line with the Housing: Optional Technical Standards?

6.1.1 Paragraph 6 of the NPPF (2012) states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development – highlighting the three dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental. Further to this, paragraph 58 of the 2012 NPPF states: “Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

- will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
- optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;
- respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
- create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and
- are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.”

6.1.2 Policy SPL3 seeks to achieve the overarching aspirations set out in the NPPF and give effect to paragraph 58. It is essentially the ‘go to’ Development Management policy that will apply in the determination of most if not all planning applications for new development and changes of use - with the aim of achieving sustainable development and good design.

- 6.1.3 The policy as a whole and the wording within it attracted relatively few objections during the Regulation 19 consultation, and all the criteria are considered justified and consistent with the above outlined national policy. Many of the criteria have been carried forward and amended from policies QL9, 10 and 11 in the Council's 2007 adopted Local Plan which have provided a sound framework for determining planning applications for many years in line with long-established planning principles. The requirements of the new policy are considered reasonable, and with the Council's suggested modifications ([SM1](#)) will be even more clearly articulated and effective in achieving the aims of the policy itself and the relevant national policy.
- 6.1.4 Part B (a) of the policy relates specifically to access to new development sites and the impact on the highway network. The criterion reflects the guidance in paragraph 32 of the Framework, which requires Plans to ensure that, among other things, safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people, and that development only be prevented on transport grounds when the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. A proposed modification to this criterion strengthens consistency with national policy by replacing the phrase 'unacceptable increase in congestion' with 'severe traffic impact'.
- 6.1.5 Part B (d) requires developers to demonstrate that new development will minimise the production of greenhouse gases and impact on climate change. Suggested modifications ([SM1](#)) to the criterion seek to strengthen the Council's approach – following the authority's declaration of a Climate Emergency in August 2019 – by pushing for all new development to incorporate solar panels and charging points for electric vehicles, in addition to the prevailing Building Regulations at the time and other policies in the plan. The Council is also suggesting some significant amendments to Policy PPL10 aimed at tackling climate change and improving energy efficiency and these are discussed in more detail in response to question 8.4.
- 6.1.6 The relevance of the optional technical housing standards to development in Tendring relates more to the size and internal dimensions of new residential development than the technologies that could be employed to achieve energy efficiency and address climate change concerns. The Council's application of the technical standards are discussed in response to question 6.2.

6.2 Housing Density and Standards (LP3) and Housing Layout (LP4)

Is the requirement to meet minimum standards of internal space clearly articulated and supported by clear evidence?

Are the criteria in LP3 and LP4 justified and consistent with national policy? Are they clearly articulated, and would the policy be effective?

Is the Council's proposed modification to the policy and supporting text necessary for soundness?

- 6.2.1 Paragraph 47 in the 2012 NPPF (5th bullet-point) requires local planning authorities to set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances. Accordingly, Policy LP3 requires new residential and mixed-use development to achieve an appropriate housing density, and sets out the criteria and the factors to be considered when assessing development proposals.
- 6.2.2 Paragraph 58 requires local plans to develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Building upon the general expectations set out in Policy SPL3, Policy LP4 sets out the Council's specific expectations in relation to residential and mixed use develop in terms of layout and design.
- 6.2.3 The criteria within both policies are justified and consistent with national policy however the Council is suggesting some significant amendments aimed at improving their effectiveness in response to issues raised in the representations and to practical issues encountered in their application.
- 6.2.4 One of the suggested amendments applying to both policies is to clarify the Council's intention to apply the government's 'technical housing standards – nationally described space standards' to proposals for new residential development. The wording in the policies as submitted referred to 'national minimum internal floor-space standards' and 'minimum standards of internal space' – however the Council acknowledges that the policies need to be more explicit to ensure their clarity and effectiveness.
- 6.2.5 The reasoning for seeking such amendments and the justification and evidence for wanting to apply the government's technical standards was considered in a report to the Council's Planning Policy and Local Plan Committee on 8th June 2020 ([EB5.4.3](#)).
- 6.2.6 It refers to a study undertaken in August 2013 ([EB5.4.1](#)), which looking at the internal floor space of housing built in the Tendring district over several decades, providing evidence to support the application of minimum standards which concluded that internal space standards were being delivered in a majority of developments, and were

justified as a means of preventing poor living conditions in future development. Further research was conducted to support the June 2020 Committee Report, and this found that a high percentage of recent approvals (2016-present) satisfied the Gross Internal Area (GIA) standards stipulated in the nationally described standards document, further evidencing the viability and justification of the requirement.

6.2.7 Modifications are proposed to both policies, as set out in the schedule of Suggested Modifications ([SM1](#)) that aim to improve the clarity and effectiveness of the policies – strengthening criteria where necessary, adding specific details of internal space standards and private amenity space requirements, and adding new criterion to ensure new housing incorporates open space and surface water management. The main suggested modifications to Policy LP3 are:

- Amend criterion b. to make it explicitly clear that the government’s nationally described space standards will apply along with the private amenity space standards proposed for inclusion
- Re-introduce minimum private amenity space standards (from the Council’s 2007 adopted Local Plan policy HG9) which reflect the standards set out in the Essex Design Guide – as the Council’s Planning Officers have indicated that HG9 is still relied upon when dealing with planning applications for residential development.
- Mention the Jaywick Sands SPD, which is currently being prepared to guide future development and regeneration in Jaywick Sands (in particular redevelopment of existing plots within the Brooklands, Grasslands and Village Area.) The proposed standards for private amenity space are not likely to be achievable for all development in Jaywick sands due to the layout of the area, the size of plots and the need to meet the nationally prescribed space standards whilst achieving flood resilient design. The SPD is therefore likely to include bespoke standards for development in that location.
- Move the wording about Building Regulations Part M4(2&3) from policy SPL3 to Policy LP3, which is considered a more appropriate location.

6.2.8 The main suggested modifications to Policy LP4 are:

- Addition of explicit ‘urban design’ requirements, referring to: usable open space; surface water management; planning-out-crime; road layout within housing developments; on-plot parking; and high quality design that reflects and respects the character of the area.
- Addition to the final paragraph which includes additional guidance that should be considered in the determination of planning applications, including: Master Plans, Place Plans, Neighbourhood Plans, Village Design Statements, and the Jaywick Sands SPD.

6.2.9 The proposed modifications to Policies LP3 and LP4 are considered necessary to improve their effectiveness and ensure that the policies are sound.

6.3 Affordable and Council Housing (LP5) and Rural Exception Sites (LP6)

Are the criteria in LP5 justified and consistent with national policy? Are the requirements of the policy reasonable and clearly articulated and would the policy be effective?

- (a) Are the policy's requirements justified by evidence of need?**
- (b) Does the policy take appropriate account of viability?**
- (c) Is the policy sufficiently flexible?**

Does the Council's propose modifications to these policies and if so, are they necessary for soundness?

6.3.1 Paragraph 159 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area, and address the need for all types of housing – including affordable housing.

6.3.2 The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) December 2015 ([EB5.2.3](#)) demonstrates that there is a need in the Tendring District for 151 affordable homes per annum. However, income levels in Tendring are significantly lower than the national average, and depending on the assumptions made about the proportion of household income that could reasonably be spend on housing (30% or 35%) the affordable housing need would range between 151 and 278 dwellings per annum. This represents between 27.45% and 50.5% of the Objectively Assessed Need (550 dwellings per annum) as confirmed in Section 1 of the Plan.

6.3.3 Such a high level of need justifies the Council's pursuit of a target of 30% affordable housing on development sites of 11 or more dwellings.

6.3.4 The Economic Viability Study (EVS) (June 2017) REF and subsequent Economic Viability Study Addendum (EVSA) (June 2019 REF), prepared by Three Dragons with Troy Planning & Design for the council in support of the Local Plan Part 2, both support policies LP5 and LP6 concluding that "A policy of 30% affordable housing is supported on most sites. Some flexibility over density, mix or affordable housing should be maintained to allow Build to Rent schemes to come forward, or, in the Eastern value area only, specialist older persons or flatted development, or schemes with particularly high infrastructure costs" (para 11 EVSA), and that "Rural Exception Sites are deliverable in the district but if the scheme is in the Eastern area, or elsewhere if a significant number of units are rented, then a proportion of units may need to be provided as market to facilitate affordable delivery" (para 4.7 EVSA).

- 6.3.5 Both viability studies followed the relevant regulations and guidance and are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, para 173 (and 2019) and Planning Practice Guidance for Viability at March 2014. They were prepared in consultation with the development industry and take account of relevant policies in the publication draft Local Plan (2013-2033 & beyond).
- 6.3.6 In accordance with PPG (006 Reference ID: 10-006-20140306) both studies examined a set of residential typologies and were supplemented by a more detailed assessment of 3 SAMU sites. General assumptions are summarised in chapter 2 of both reports and set out in more detail in Appendix I. Notes of the original consultation on which they are based can be found in Appendix III of the EVS and the further consultation is discussed chapter 2 of the EVSA.
- 6.3.7 The studies identified 3 distinct value areas for the district in which all the typologies were tested: Frinton Cluster; Manningtree & Rural North; and Eastern. In the case of policy LP5, the EVSA found that all general mixed development of houses and flats was viable at a full policy position, in all value areas, and able to deliver 30% affordable housing alongside other S106 obligations, policy requirements and relevant infrastructure costs. There were some exceptions for particular types of site in the Eastern value area (retirement housing and 100% flatted development), but this finding is not significant enough to suggest that 30% affordable housing could not be realised on most other sites in the Eastern value area. The specific SAMU sites (1,2 & 3) included additional s106 & infrastructure but were still able to deliver 30% affordable housing. Details of the testing and results can be found in chapters 3 and 4 of the EVS and chapter 3 of the EVSA.
- 6.3.8 Regarding policy LP6, the EVSA found that Rural Exception Sites (RES) can be delivered in the district without recourse to unfettered open market housing in both the Frinton Cluster and Manningtree & Rural North but in the Eastern value area 30% market housing was included in the mix to produce a viable scheme. The housing mix on RES will always respond to local need and if a higher number of affordable rented tenure was needed, or development was occurring in the Eastern value area, then it is likely that some market units should be developed to facilitate delivery (unless grant was available) at around 30%, as per policy LP6, was demonstrated as a suitable level.
- 6.3.9 A full list of how all policies were considered can be found in EVS Appendix II but of particular note is that, as well as policies LP5 and LP6, the studies took account of SPL3 - Accessible & Adaptable Homes and LP3 – Housing Density & Standards – (B) New housing to be built to ‘national minimum internal floor-space standards’.
- 6.3.10 The assumptions for affordable housing were based upon consultation with Registered Providers developing in the district and with the council’s Housing Officer. The

affordable housing mix takes account of housing need identified in the SHMA, as per policy LP2.

6.3.11 Reflecting the draft policies and the local market, the Benchmark Land Values are considered to 'provide a competitive return to willing developers and land owners' as per PPG (014 Reference ID: 10-014-20140306). They have been based on a review of sources such as "Land Values for Policy Appraisal" (MHCLG), previous local viability studies, existing use values (+premium), and known values achieved within the district. Values for RES are based on consultation with Registered Providers, they are lower than for other development because the residential use of the site is restricted to this particular type of development. All values were presented at the developer workshop and were the subject of interviews with individual stakeholders and local agents which gave confirmation of findings. They are discussed in the EVS at paragraph 2.12 and in EVSA at 2.6.

6.3.12 The policy stipulates that the size and type of affordable housing will be specified by the Council on a case-by-case basis, allowing the Council to have regard to the latest housing needs register – and this will be the subject of negotiation between the Council and the developer. The policy is therefore sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time, while not being overly flexible to allow under delivery of affordable housing against the assessed need.

6.3.13 The Council proposes a number of modifications policy LP5:

- Removing references to 'Council Housing' and referring just to 'Affordable Housing'
- Removal of the alternative to accept 10% Affordable Housing alongside a financial contribution towards delivering the remainder of the 30% contribution – in light of the Council's Housing Strategy 2020-2025 ([EB5.1.1](#)) and to address weak past delivery of affordable housing.
- Deletion of the final two paragraphs of the policy, allowing proposals that provide alternative forms of affordable housing and requiring planning applications to be accompanied by an affordable housing statement.

6.3.14 The Council propose modifications to the final paragraph of policy LP6:

- Addition of the text 'biodiversity and geodiversity (including designated sites)'
- Addition of text '(including designated landscapes), the historic environment,'

6.3.15 These modifications to Policy LP5 are considered necessary for soundness. Amending references to 'council housing' improves the clarity and ensures consistency with national policy and the definition of affordable housing. Removal of the alternative to accept 10% affordable housing will increase the policy's

effectiveness in delivering enough affordable housing to meet the need outlined above. In light of the suggested modifications which remove alternative options of affordable housing provision, the requirement for all residential planning applications of 11 or more dwellings to be accompanied by an affordable housing statement is no longer considered justified.

6.3.16 Additions to Policy LP6 make it more effective in preventing development of affordable housing in locations where it would be harmful to the surrounding environment, and are considered consistent with national policy.

6.4 Self-Build and Custom-Built Homes (LP7)

Is the policy justified and consistent with national policy? Are the requirements of the policy clear, and would they be effective?

- (a) In particular, are the policy's requirements justified by evidence of need?**
- (b) Is the policy otherwise effective and consistent with national policy?**
- (c) Are the Council's proposed modifications to the policy and supporting text necessary for soundness?**

6.4.1 Paragraph 50 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to deliver a wide choice of homes, and plan for a mix of housing that meets the needs of different groups in the community – such as people wishing to build their own homes. The Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 goes further, requiring local authorities to keep a register of those seeking to acquire serviced plots and to give enough suitable developments permissions to meet the identified demand.

6.4.2 Policy LP7 sets out the criteria against which proposals for self-build and custom housing developments will be considered – encouraging their provision on large development sites and redevelopment of existing dwellings and allowing developments to take place in certain locations outside of, but within close proximity to, settlement development boundaries of the larger more sustainable settlements where regular residential development would not ordinarily be supported. The policy seeks to achieve the delicate balance of 1) allowing fair opportunities for further self-build developments to come forward knowing that land within settlement development boundaries is a diminishing resource with larger sites often acquired by housebuilders; and 2) still upholding the core principles of the planning system and the spatial strategy of the local plan by actively managing patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling – and thus minimising the reliance on private car use. The policy represents what is considered to be the most appropriate response to meeting self-build and custom-build needs.

6.4.3 The Council's Self-Build and Custom House Building (SBCHB) Register ([EB5.2.4](#)) demonstrates that there is a clear need for suitable plots for self-build and custom-built homes within the Tendring District. The register is split into base periods, which begin on 31th October each year. At the end of the fifth base period, 30th October 2020, there were 82 names on the register of people interested in finding land on which to build their own home. At the end of each base period, relevant authorities have three years to permission an equivalent number of plots of land, which are suitable for self-build and custom housebuilding, as there are entries for that base period. Annual monitoring and analysis of the annual housing schedules ([EB5.3.3](#)) demonstrates that the Council is currently fulfilling its statutory duty to grant development permission for enough suitable serviced plots. In the four years since the end of the first base period, planning permissions have been granted for 217 single dwelling developments, which are well placed to meet the needs of people wishing to build their own home. In the years since the self-build register was established, increasing weight has been given to policies in the emerging plan when determining planning applications – and the ability of the Council to meet the demand demonstrated by the SBCHB Register demonstrates that the requirements of the policy are both justified and effective.

6.4.4 The Council has proposed the following modifications ([SM1](#)) to the wording of policy LP7, in light of comments received during the Regulation 19 Consultation:

- Remove the words 'on their merits'.
- Add the words 'where any adverse impacts would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when considered against other policies in this Local Plan'.

6.4.5 These modifications will make the policy more precise and more closely aligned with national policy, but are not strictly considered necessary for its soundness.

6.7 Traveller Sites (LP9)

Is the policy justified and consistent with national policy? Are the requirements of the policy clear, and would they be effective?

- (a) Is the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2017) up to date and robust in its identification of needs for plots and pitches?**
- (b) Does the Council's approach in relation to traveller sites generally conform with the expectations of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015)?**
- (c) Does policy LP9 provide an adequate criterion-based policy for the assessment of Gypsy and Traveller site proposals.**
- (d) Are the Council's proposed modifications to the policy and supporting text necessary for soundness?**

6.7.1 The Tendring Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) ([EB5.2.6](#)) was conducted in 2017 by Opinion Research Services (ORS) – one of the country’s leading consultations in the preparation of GTAAs. Their methodology and assessments reflect the definition of the gypsies and travellers in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) and have been found to be robust by the Planning Inspector for the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy. The GTAA has a base date of September 2016, and assesses the need future need in the plan period to 2033. The methodology used for the assessment, which is set out in the Essex GTAA Joint Methodology ([EB5.2.8](#)), accords with national policy and the needs identified are based on robust and up-to-date evidence.

6.7.2 The Tendring GTAA identifies a future need, to 2033, of just 1 pitch to meet the needs of travellers that do meet the 2015 definition, 2 pitches for those whose status is unknown/unclear and 3 pitches for those not meeting the 2015 definition. The GTAA confirms that there is no need for plots for Travelling Showpeople and that the need for any transit provision should be kept under review.

6.7.3 The following table identifies the number of existing and additional permitted pitches within the Tendring District as at an April 2020 base date (The Council is aware that a version of this table in Topic Paper 2 (Housing) showed ‘Land South of Gutteridge Hall Lane’ in two separate rows. The additional row was not counted in the total, however, so its removal does not affect the overall position).

Site	Number of existing pitches	Number of additional pitches with planning permission
Esther Lee Stables, Crockleford Heath	1	1
Land adjacent to Pump Station, Elmstead Market	1	0
Woodfield Bungalow, Great Bentley	5	5
Spring Stables, Gutteridge Hall Lane, Weeley	3	5
The Rose, The Street, Kirby le Soken	1	0
Land south of Gutteridge Hall Lane, Weeley	1	0
Total	12	11

6.7.4 With a total need of up to 6 pitches and planning permissions in place to deliver 11, it is clear that there is no need for the Council to make any specific allocations in the Local Plan to meet the future needs of gypsies and travellers. Furthermore, Policy SP8 in Section 1 of the Local Plan (as proposed for modification following the examination)

states that the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community will incorporate around 2,200 dwellings within the plan period (as part of an overall total of between 7,000 -9,000 homes) and provision for Gypsy and Travellers which will be more clearly defined, in spatial terms, through the Development Plan Document (DPD) for that location. The additional provision through the DPD will enable the Tendring and Colchester to work together to meet longer-term pitch needs giving effect to requirement c) under paragraph 10 of the PPTS.

6.7.5 Further to the above table, the Council has reviewed the situation at the identified sites and, at the time of writing, can report the following updates:

- Esther Lee Stables, Crockleford Heath: The additional pitch has now been implemented.
- Land adj to Pump Station, Elmstead Market: Planning permission has been granted for a permanent dwelling, which will result in the loss of this pitch.
- Woodfield Bungalow, Great Bentley: Five additional pitches have been implemented.
- Coppice View, Carrington Road, Great Bentley: Two existing pitches and one additional pitch with permission not included in previous count.

6.7.6 These updates result in the total of existing pitches increasing to 19, and the number of additional pitches with planning permission decreasing to 6. The overall total number of pitches has therefore increased from 23 to 25 – which comfortably meets the projected need.

6.7.7 Paragraph 11 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 (PPTS) states: *“Criteria should be set to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need. Where there is no identified need, criteria-based policies should be included to provide a basis for decisions in case applications nevertheless come forward. Criteria based policies should be fair and should facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.”* As the most up to date evidence identifies no need for the plan period, Policy LP9 sets criteria which will be used to determine applications that do come forward – which is consistent with the PPTS.

6.7.8 The Council has suggested modifications ([SM1](#)) to Policy LP9 to in light of the latest GTAA evidence, representations received during the Regulation 19 consultation, and to improve clarity. The policy sets clear criteria against which proposals for additional pitches will be assessed, and it is considered that the proposed modifications will ensure the policy is justified and effective.

6.8 Care, Independent Assisted Living (LP10)

Is the policy justified and consistent with national policy? Are the requirements of the policy clear, and would they be effective?

- (a) In particular, are the policy's requirements justified by evidence of need?**
- (b) Is the policy otherwise effective and consistent with national policy?**

- 6.8.1 Policy LP10 provides support for specialist accommodation to meet the needs of a growing elderly population, encouraging the provision of care homes and extra-care housing in sustainable locations and within the mix of accommodation for residential and mixed-use developments across the district. The policy also allows care homes out of settlement development boundaries so long as they meet certain criteria (recognising that land within settlement development boundaries is a diminishing resource with many sites acquired by housebuilders). The policy approach gives effect to paragraph 50 of the NPPF, which requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends – meeting the needs of different groups in the community such as older people and people with disabilities.
- 6.8.2 The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) December 2015 ([EB5.2.3](#)) (paragraph 6.8) highlights that given the dramatic growth in the older population and the higher levels of disability and health problems amongst older people, there is likely to be an increased requirement for specialist housing options moving forward.
- 6.8.3 Table 6.2 in the SHMA set out the supply, in 2014, of specialist housing for older people in the Housing Market Area representing a ratio of 123 units per 1,000 people aged 75 and over. Paragraph 6.10 in the SHMA identifies that the ratio varies between the different authorities within the HMA with 95 per 1,000 in Colchester, 107 in Tendring, 144 in Braintree and 151 in Chelmsford. Table 6.2 also shows the amount of specialist accommodation that would be required by the population in 2037 if the current rate of occupation was maintained. Applying that methodology, the SHMA projects a need for an additional 7,157 units of sheltered housing and 319 units of extra care housing across the HMA between 2014 and 2037. Increasing the ratio from 123 units to 170 units per 1,000 people aged 75 and over (in line with Strategic Housing for Older People tool developed by the Housing Learning and Improvement Network) would generate a high projected need of 10,370 units of sheltered housing and 2,631 units of extra care housing.
- 6.8.4 Applying the two scenarios indicate that the need for specialist accommodation could represent between 10.4% and 18% of the overall objectively assessed housing need for the HMA, although the authors of the SHMA advise (in paragraph 6.11) that it would be appropriate for the Councils to pursue the lower of the two figures which is based

on current occupation patterns and which reflects evidence of higher than expected levels of vacancy amongst some of the HMA's sheltered housing stock.

6.8.5 A number of specialist developments have been built in recent years in different locations across the district including:

- Beaumont Manor Care Home, Kirby Cross (82 beds) (where planning permission is in place to deliver an additional 41 extra-care properties within the grounds;
- Beaumont House 60 unit extra-care housing complex, Walton (part of the wider Martello site/Hamford Park development);
- Mistley Manor, Mistley (83 rooms) built on the edge of the settlement of Mistley; and
- Rosebank Park, Dovercourt (70 units) extra-care development.

6.8.6 Planning permission has also been granted for a 60-unit extra care facility in Coppins Road, Clacton which is in the early stages of construction and which is being led by Essex Housing.

6.8.7 The evidence presented in the SHMA clearly evidences the need for specialised care provision in the district, and it is considered that the policy is effective in enabling the market to deliver accommodation that meets that need – as evidenced by the above listed developments.