

**Table 11.1 Development Examples in Essex Case Study**

<b>Re fN o</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>	<b>GFA/oth er</b>	<b>Zon e</b>	<b>Current Standard Mostly Min.</b>	<b>Actual Provisio n</b>	<b>Matrix (Maximum)</b>	<b>Comment on outcome provision</b>
1	Sheltered Flats	(36 units)	1/2	1 per 2 units	13	Not specified	Consistent with Matrix
2	Change use to B1	470 m <sup>2</sup>	1/2	11-18	20	5 - 9	Over provision: less of an issue for small scale devt?
3	Change office to flats	(88 units)	1	176	88	66	25% more than Matrix maximum*
4	Extension of Office/Ind/W'hse	2,314	3	11 new	17 new	Not specified	Car based development inconsistent with Matrix* unless high HGV traffic generation
5	Multiplex Cinema, Restaurant	5,296	2	1247	312	16-21	LA negotiated 25% of standard, but still 1,400% more than Matrix*
6	Multiplex + Retail	6,151	1	< 66	0	31	Consistent with Matrix
7	Entertainment centre	13,280	1	160-330	145	66	120% more than Matrix maximum*
8	Mixed Leisure/Retail	13,819	1	1,000	5	70	Consistent with Matrix
9	Roller Coaster	(1490 capacity)	1	Not specified	0	Not specified	Consistent with Matrix. Parking demand to be met in public car parks, planned to be increased
10	Higher Education	15,670	1	388	360	78	360% more than Matrix maximum*
11	Extend Bar	197	1	49	0	0	Consistent with Matrix
12	Hotel/Restaurant	1,498	2	130 approx	102	30	240% more than Matrix maximum*

13	Food Superstore	7,690	3	770	830	Would not be permitted	Car based development inconsistent with Matrix*
14	Food Superstore	6,500	3	650	650	Would not be permitted	Car based development inconsistent with Matrix*

continued

<b>Re fN o</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>	<b>GFA/other</b>	<b>Zon e</b>	<b>Current Standard Mostly Min.</b>	<b>Actual Provisio n</b>	<b>Matrix (Maximum)</b>	<b>Comment on outcome provision</b>
15	Hotel/Restaurant	2,281	3	125-165	140	Would not be permitted	Car based development inconsistent with Matrix*
16	Office	1,077	3	25	60	Would not be permitted	Car based development inconsistent with Matrix*
17	Residential	197	1	296-394	157	197	Consistent with Matrix
18	Retail and Leisure	26,384	2	1,300 approx	1,000	Would not be permitted	Car based development inconsistent with Matrix*
19	Foodstore + Lockups	2,900	3	290	269		Car based development inconsistent with Matrix*

\* Note: Developments inconsistent with the Matrix would need to have been changed in one or more of the following ways:

- Non-car accessibility to be improved up to level for Zone 1 or Zone 2 status
- Reduce scale of development consistent with more local service function
- Relocate development to site in Zone 1 or Zone 2