



Regulation 19 Consultation Spreadsheet
Representations and Responses to the Castle Point Plan

Ordered by policy number B-H

January 2026

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0282-0013	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	B1	Not Stated		No	Not Stated	ECC seek an additional criteria to make reference to greening the town centre and providing biodiversity net gain at street level and above consistent with Policy C1, criteria 10.	ECC require an additional Criteria to read: Opportunities for greening the town centre and providing biodiversity net gain at street level and above	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Require additional criteria to reference greening town centre and providing biodiversity net gain	Accepted and additional criteria added to policy	4. Development proposals must be designed to protect and enhance ~~enable~~ and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). 5. Opportunities for greening the town centre and providing biodiver

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			sity net gain at street level and above
0 3 3 6 - 0 0 1 0	Organisati on	Car olin e	Pete rs	Esse x Poli ce		B1	Not Sta ted	The DOCO recognises the potential for the redevelopment of the Town Centres and notes there is a requirement for mixed used development. Mixed used buildings can be difficult to secure if safety and security are not recognised in the early designed stages. At the appropriate stage it is advised there is liaison with the DOCO to ensure safety of residents is considered and CPTED principles have been applied.	No t Sta ted			The DOCO would like to bring to your attention, the Home Office strategy of reducing Violence Against Women and Girls' (VAWG). The strategy aims to improve wellbeing and perception of crime for women and girls, thus ensuring their safety within their community. Therefore, it is recommended when designing new and adapting public realm and green spaces (inclusive of walking, cycling and play areas,) that consideration should be given to environmental design so that women and girls feel included and comfortable using the spaces. "Women and girls often do not feel safe in parks and so use them less. This is not just because they fear crime, whether that's rape, assault, or harassment. They also feel uncomfortable, unwelcomed, and judged. Women are three times more likely than men to feel unsafe in parks during the day, and that gets worse after dark". Safer Parks Improving access for women and girls: Safer Parks Executive Summary (greenflagaward.org)				A	Mixed use buildings can be difficult to secure if safety and security are not recognised in the early designed stages. At the appropriate stage it is advised there is liaison with the DOCO to ensure safety of residents is considered and CPTED principles have been applied.	Policy D1 requires opportunities for design out crime to be taken.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0282-0014	Organisation	Kevin	Frasier	Essex County Council	Yes	B2	Not Stated		No	Effective	ECC seek an additional criteria to make reference to greening the town centre and providing biodiversity net gain at street level and above consistent with Policy C1, criteria 10. ECC welcome reference to the topography as being a potential barrier to active travel use from Benfleet Station to the north east such as Thundersley and Hadleigh, in particular with regards Route 12 in the LCWIP connecting from Benfleet Station to Hadleigh town centre, utilising the trails through Benfleet Down and Hadleigh Country Park. Paragraph 9.9 refers to the transport modelling for the Plan indicating a number of listed transport improvements in Benfleet. Further work will be required to ascertain how this relate, can be funded and delivered by particular development sites/clusters. ECC seek reference should also be made to the provision of a mobility hub at Benfleet Station consistent with Policies T1, Criteria 5 and T4, Criteria 6.	ECC require an additional Criteria to read: Opportunities for greening the town centre and providing biodiversity net gain at street level and above This will need to be considered when considering how the Schedule of Interventions relate to specific development sites and/or clusters to feed into any future update to the IDP. ECC seek paragraph 9.9 includes an additional travel outcome to read: Create a mobility hub at Benfleet Station	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Require additional criteria to reference greening town centre and providing biodiversity net gain The Topography in Benfleet is a potential barrier to active travel use from Benfleet Station to the Northeast towards Thundersley and Hadleigh and would require further consideration to feed into how the Schedule of Interventions relate to specific development sites and/or clusters to feed into any future update to the IDP. Transport improvements in Benfleet will require further assessment to ascertain how they relate to development coming forward and how they would be delivered to development funded. Provision of a mobility hub at Benfleet Station should be included in the criteria	Noted Accepted. Further work would be required through the planning process. Reference made to the provision of a mobility hub at Benfleet Station	5. Opportunities for greening the town centre and providing biodiversity net gain at street level and above

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0336-0011	Organisati on	Car olin e	Pete rs	Esse x Poli ce		B2	Not Sta ted	The DOCO recognises the potential for the redevelopment of the Town Centres and notes there is a requirement for mixed used development. Mixed used buildings can be difficult to secure if safety and security are not recognised in the early designed stages. At the appropriate stage it is advised there is liaison with the DOCO to ensure safety of residents is considered and CPTED principles have been applied.	No t Sta ted			The DOCO would like to bring to your attention, the Home Office strategy of reducing Violence Against Women and Girls' (VAWG). The strategy aims to improve wellbeing and perception of crime for women and girls, thus ensuring their safety within their community. Therefore, it is recommended when designing new and adapting public realm and green spaces (inclusive of walking, cycling and play areas,) that consideration should be given to environmental design so that women and girls feel included and comfortable using the spaces. “Women and girls often do not feel safe in parks and so use them less. This is not just because they fear crime, whether that’s rape, assault, or harassment. They also feel uncomfortable, unwelcomed, and judged. Women are three times more likely than men to feel unsafe in parks during the day, and that gets worse after dark”. Safer Parks Improving access for women and girls: Safer Parks Executive Summary (greenflagaward.org)				A	Mixed use buildings can be difficult to secure if safety and security are not recognised in the early designed stages. At the appropriate stage it is advised there is liaison with the DOCO to ensure safety of residents is considered and CPTED principles have been applied.	Policy D1 requires opportunities for design out crime to be taken.	N
0336-0012	Organisati on	Car olin e	Pete rs	Esse x Poli ce		B3	Not Sta ted	The DOCO recognises the potential for the redevelopment of the Town Centres and notes there is a requirement for mixed used development. Mixed used buildings can be difficult to secure if safety and security are not recognised in the				The DOCO would like to bring to your attention, the Home Office strategy of reducing Violence Against Women and Girls' (VAWG). The strategy aims to improve wellbeing and perception of crime for women and girls, thus ensuring their safety within				A	Mixed use buildings can be difficult to secure if safety and security are not recognised in the early designed stages. At the appropriate stage it is advised there is	Policy D1 requires opportunities for design out crime to be taken.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								early designed stages. At the appropriate stage it is advised there is liaison with the DOCO to ensure safety of residents is considered and CPTED principles have been applied.				their community. Therefore, it is recommended when designing new and adapting public realm and green spaces (inclusive of walking, cycling and play areas,) that consideration should be given to environmental design so that women and girls feel included and comfortable using the spaces. “Women and girls often do not feel safe in parks and so use them less. This is not just because they fear crime, whether that’s rape, assault, or harassment. They also feel uncomfortable, unwelcomed, and judged. Women are three times more likely than men to feel unsafe in parks during the day, and that gets worse after dark”. Safer Parks Improving access for women and girls: Safer Parks Executive Summary (greenflagaward.org)					liaison with the DOCO to ensure safety of residents is considered and CPTED principles have been applied.		
0 4 2 6 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	L	M Cov erle y		Yes	B3	Yes	Not Stated	Yes		Not Stated		No			A	Policy B3 is legally sound and compliant	Support noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 7 2 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jan et	Dun ford		Yes	B5	No	Not able to provide an emergency plan to evacuation plan as this area only has one means of entry and already over developed. The air quality does not meet the required standard and when asked to a councillor was told this does not matter. It does not met the the legal compliance as grey belt has notbeen used in the plan.	No	Consistent with national policy	Over development of an area that has only one means of entry and exit and no emergency flood plan with no planned improvements for access.	Include the north thundersley site in the draft plan and remove the sites C4, C9, C10F, C10G.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	C	Air Quality Emergency Evacuation Plan Green/Grey Belt not considered Third Road needed onto Canvey	Air Quality Air quality impacts are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal, under objective 9.1. Annual Status Reports for Castle Point can be found on the Essex Air website along with further information relating to air quality within Castle Point. Castle Point monitor nitrogen dioxide using diffusion tubes at 30 monitoring locations around the district. The main source of pollution in the Borough is road traffic emissions from major roads, notably the A13, A127 and A130. The Council has not declared any Air Quality Management Areas	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		(AQMAS). Generally, air pollution is low in Castle Point. Results from the monitoring points across the Borough suggest that air quality is improving. Emergency Evacuation Plan The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Third Road onto Canvey The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		assessing impacts and recommending interventions. Access improvements for Canvey are a strategic matter which cannot be addressed through the Castle Point Plan alone, as any growth is only a proportion of the demand for those access improvements . The bulk of the demand come from the existing 16,000 households on Canvey. However, the strategic need for access improvements to Canvey Island have been identified through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		specifically identifies three projects which will improve accessibility to and from the Island. The Local Transport Plan sits alongside the Castle Point Plan, and the development in the Castle Point Plan will make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan.	
0 2 8 2 - 0 0 1 5	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	B6	Not Sta ted		No	Effective	ECC notes that the site allocation is within a Waste Consultation Area in relation to a waste site on Armstrong Road (ref ESS/37/18/CPT). It is requested that this is reflected in the text of the policy and includes reference to the need for a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment as part of any subsequent application. ECC notes that the site allocation is within a Waste Consultation Area in relation to a waste site on Armstrong Road (ref ESS/37/18/CPT). It is requested that this is	ECC require an additional Criteria to read: Undertake a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment ECC require the reasoned justification is amended to read: The site is located within a Waste Consultation Area regarding the waste site at Armstrong Road. As a result, a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment should be undertaken.	Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie d 8 addi ton al app endi ces con taini ng vari ous piec	B	The site is within a Waste Consultation Area at Armstrong Road and a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment would be required. This should be referenced in the policy The site is within a Waste Consultation Area at Armstrong Road and a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment would be required. This should be	Accepted and additional text added requiring a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment Accepted and additional text added requiring a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment in the reasoned justification	Add additional Criteria 5. A Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment is undertaken given the site is located within a Waste

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											reflected in the text of the policy and includes reference to the need for a Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment as part of any subsequent application.				es of evid enc e		referenced in the reasoned justification		Consulta tion Area in relation to the waste site on Armstro ng Road. See above addition al criteria added ECC require the reasone d justificat ion is amende d to read: The site is located within a Waste Consulta tion Area regardin g the waste site at Armstro ng Road. As a result, a Waste Infrastru

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			cture Impact Assessm ent should be undertak en
0 2 2 4 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ellie	Murray		Yes	B7	Yes	Dear Sir/Madam I do not support the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft Consultation I consider the draft plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the draft plan to be sound South Benfleet Playing Fields are a vital flood plane for the area and provide a much loved and necessary community amenity. The result of any potential development within and beyond Richmond Avenue car park area may effect the flood plan and have serious consequences for housing in that area. One example of this was clearly demonstrated in Worcestershire and Somerset where development had been undertaken on and around flood planes which resulted in severe flooding in winter. Currently during extended periods of wet weather large areas of South Benfleet playing fields already become unusable and should any proposed development take place in the Richmond Road car park and extend into the park area this will effectively remove a significant area of the playing fields. REDACTED we already receive text notifications regarding flood warnings from the		Not Sta ted		No	B - see 022 4- 000 2 and add itio nal sup port ing evid enc e	The result of any potential development within and beyond Richmond Avenue car park area may effect the flood plan and have serious consequences for housing in that area. [REDACTED] we already receive text notifications regarding flood warnings from the Environmental Agency surely these warnings will only increase with any development. The potential to build 27 homes and retain the local parking space will result in a cramped development encroaching on the playing fields and the building of flats is out of keeping for the area. The removal of the car park/a reduction in spaces will drive	Comments noted. Note that Policy B9 of the Plan is for South Benfleet Playing Fields to be master planned as a multi-functional green space. Part 3 of the policy is for New areas for water storage that will enhance the role of the area as a reservoir, and reduce the flood risk to those living on the periphery of the open space.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											Environmental Agency surely these warnings will only increase with any development. The potential to build 27 homes and retain the local parking space will result in a cramped development encroaching on the playing fields and the building of flats is out of keeping for the area. The removal of the car park/a reduction in spaces will drive the cars to park onto Richmond Avenue which already has minimal parking available with drivers parking on the pavements making its difficult for wheelchair users and parents with babies and young children. As residents who have enjoyed continuous and uninterrupted use of the rear access from our property, we would state that we have a prescriptive right to this continued access. Along with the above Castle Point has recently confirmed that a transformation of Richmond Park and South Benfleet playing fields green space. With development of the houses will drive the community away from using the improved areas due to a reduction of the parking spaces along with years of ongoing building work which will create an eye sore to the projects if the building of houses was granted. We strongly oppose any						the cars to park onto Richmond Avenue which already has minimal parking available with drivers parking on the pavements making its difficult for wheelchair users and parents with babies and young children. As residents who have enjoyed continuous and uninterrupted use of the rear access from our property, we would state that we have a prescriptive right to this continued access.		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development of South Benfleet playing fields.								
0 2 2 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Elli e	Murr ay		Yes	B7	Yes		Ye s		An image is attached from Thursday 2nd October at 11:12am, where the car park is full & therefore where would these cars then be parked. This car park is used by both Parents and careers of those who attend South Benfleet Primary School, where it offers free and safe parking during the drop off/collection period. The cars would then be forced to park elsewhere as detailed in the paragraph above.		Not Sta ted		Yes	Non e	Image attached	Noted	N
0 8 2 3 - 0 0 0 9	Organisati on	Pat	Abb ott	Envi ron men t Age ncy	Yes	B7	Yes		No	Justified	We note that site B7A (Richmond Avenue Car Park) is located in an area, shown by the current Flood Map for Planning, as falling within Flood Zone's 2 and 3. The Level 2 SFRA site summary (used as evidence base for Sequential Approach considerations) shows the site as predominantly within Flood Zone 1 – see below The Level 2 SFRA dated July 2025 has used outputs from the Flood Map for Planning prior to its update on 25th March 2025 which utilised		No	Not Ans wer ed		A	The EA referred to the New National Flood Risk Assessment in their response to the Regulation 19 Public Consultation to the Castle Point Plan. It was noted that flood extents at two site allocation sites (Site B7A- Richmond Avenue car park and Site B8 Manor Trading Estate) had changed as a result of the NaFRA2 modelling.	It is agreed that policy B7A and B8 has been updated to reflect the New National Flood Risk Assessment and be re-evaluated. The SFRA has been updated to take account of the New National Flood Risk Assessment and Sites B7A and B8 have been re-	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											the new National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA) data. We were not consulted by the LPA during the preparation of the Level 2 SFRA Site Assessments, and would have advised the LPA over the change in understanding over the extent of Flood Zones affecting this site. We would recommend that the Council reviews this site allocation by providing an updated SFRA Level 2 site evaluation to provide site-specific recommendations on the siting of residential and commercial development. This should take a Sequential Approach to the location of “more vulnerable” development to areas of the site that are at the lowest risk of flooding and making suitable text amendments to the site policy that would direct any housing development to be sited outside of the areas understood to be within Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the boundaries of the site. It should also be ensured that the site passes the flood risk sequential test taking into account the current flood risk affecting the site.								evaluated to ensure that the Sustainability Appraisal and Sequential Test are properly considered, and Level 2 SFRA site assessment has been updated for both sites.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0334-0001	Organisation	Glen	Smith	ACT Roadways ltd		B8	No	This submission is by and on behalf of A.C.T Roadways Ltd who are the title owners of HMLR EX590021 which encompasses the whole of the Private Road & Path network on the Manor Trading Estate. Benfleet Essex. Significantly The Manor Trading Estate (MTE) is the only significant industrial / commercial space within Benfleet, it is the 2nd biggest designated employment area in within Castle Point. When I suggest 2nd that excludes CPBC themselves. They have a significant workforce that is financially support by the business rates collected from the business throughout castle point, of which 50% is retained by CPBC! We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft is NOT compliant, is therefore Unsound, legally or otherwise. CPBC have numerous documents which clearly indicate they have misled the residents of Castle Point! They have informed all in Castle Point that they have engaged with the business that drive and invest in the local economy providing much needed new business premises and local employment opportunities. This Regulation 19 document has relayed to the residents of Castle Point that	No		There are many significant anomalies surrounding the plan and or information relayed in the reg 19 document and the meeting notes. I highlight below just some those anomalies 1. Castle Point have a business forum it located via this link Castle Point Business Forum CastlePoint The attached snapshots are from the Business Forum & Bussiness Support & regeneration page drawn down 23/09/25 @13.56 Hrs Castle Point Business Forum The Castle Point Business Forum is currently inactive. However, we are looking to relaunch this forum in 2024. If you would like to become a part of this forum shaping its new direction, please email us at business@castlepoint.gov.uk • So much for engaging with business. The dates above indicate that last available date the forum was available would have been at best 31st Dec 2023. How long have the officers been developing this plan? Business Support and Regeneration Our Economic Development and Regeneration Team is responsible for developing and delivering business support and regeneration projects to support improvements within the Borough that help to make			Yes - see attachment	B - see 0334 - 003	<u>Manor Trading Estate</u> Object to both the policy (particularly perception of partail replavement with residential) and the level of engagement to inform it.	<u>Manor Trading Estate</u> Noted Manor Trading Estate is included within Policy E1 which includes the statement ' the Council will seek to provide and retain Class E(g), B2 and B8 use classes or other ‘sui generis’ uses of a similar employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes'	N	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
								we the business’s in Castle Point agree with the plan! Further that not only do we agree with it. CPBC have significantly informed everyone that we were involved in its development! That we also relayed our views to them, and that the officers and councillors alike at Castle Point took our views and opinions on board, which culminated in this draft local plan. That is totally NOT TRUE perhaps same officers & councillors might produce those supporting documents? As with all local plans the driver behind a local plan is the economy. The economy is driven by investment, 95% of investment comes from private business. Unlike most local authorities CPBC do not appear to have an adopted Regeneration & Economic Growth Strategy. Although CPBC do have a dedicated councillor who holds and has held the post / title of “Cabinet Member” recently re-titled “Portfolio Holder” responsible for Yes you guessed it “Regeneration & Economic Growth” since 2023. As previously stated, it is FACT not hearsay that I / We the private Road network owner at the MTE have never ever had a conversation, an email from that individual, Nor CPBC supposed			the area a better place to live and work. • CPBC have a team? Perhaps had they made contact whilst this plan was in process they might have truly reflected the opinions of the business community. Further significant anomalies – indicate a complete and utter disregard and misrepresentation to all residents and the local business community									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								regeneration team. Nor any officer who may have been involved in the drafting this unsound plan. Although I did email the cabinet member responsible for Regeneration & Economic Growth along with other committee member a concise document prior the committee meeting which identified the many anomalies contained in the draft. Which not unsurprisingly he along with other committee members totally ignored. The culmination of that meeting was a unanimous vote for this regulation 19 public consultation. For the Avoidance of doubt that same information was relayed to 2 other councillors on that 7-person committee who happened to be 2 of the 3 MTE’s Ward Councillors. None had the decency to reply let alone acknowledge the serious concerns relayed to them. So much for engaging with local business It is fact that no Officer, Councillor nor the specialist outside business consultant engaged by CPBC “Deyton Bell, have never ever engaged with A.C.T Roadways Ltd. The following is taken from CPBC website! Castle Point Council has partnered with Deyton Bell Ltd to deliver a fully funded business support program											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								under the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF), which is designed to support entrepreneurs and existing businesses within the Castle Point borough Suffice any new plan is supposedly supported by auditable evidence. Perhaps CPBC might locate all and every business engagement Q&A they received.											
0 0 8 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ala n	Daw es		Yes	B8	No	This B8 policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on MTE. This policy is not evidence based, but records show poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on the MTE.	No	Justified,	CPBC vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing a 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CPBC's Officers Mapping area the MTE is incorrect and misleads the public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is		No		No		This B8 policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on MTE. CPBC vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing a 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as previously suggested that any	Manor Trading Estate: Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.						increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CPBC's Officers Mapping area the MTE is incorrect and misleads the public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business	should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured through the revised approach to design and parking.'	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	integrated with residential homes.		
0 1 6 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Paul	Harbord		Yes	B8	No	The B8 policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on Manor Trading Estate(MTE). This policy is not evidence based, but records show poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on the MTE. CPBC's vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as it has been previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CPBC's Officers Mapping of the MTE is incorrect and misleads the public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	Policy B8 Manor Trading Estate The B8 policy is not evidence based, and officers have not engaged. CPBC's vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as it has been previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CPBC's Officers Mapping of the MTE is incorrect and misleads the public, as MTE is a	Manor Trading Estate: Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.									max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.	through the revised approach to design and parking.'	
0206-0003	Individual	Simon	Stallwood		Yes	B8	No	This B8 policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on MTE. This policy is not evidence based, but records show poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on the MTE. CBC vision is to create an	Not Stated	Not Stated			No		No		Not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. Has not considered all sites. Excluded the North West Thundersley site. Add North West Thundersley	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2. All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). North west	Y - Policy SD3(3) 'Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the constrai

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing a 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CBC's Officers Mapping area the MTE is incorrect and misleads the public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.									site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. NPPF states development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, and puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. Object for proposals for residential on Charfleets	Thundersley was not preferred for reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons site not currently a preferred alternative for allocation) and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. SUDs: Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have	nts of the specific geographic location , site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex, the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and recommendations/advice from statutory bodies (includi

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		been considered through the SFRA. Charfleets: Charfleets Industrial Estate is included within Policy E1 which includes the statement 'the Council will seek to provide and retain Class E(g), B2 and B8 use classes or other 'sui generis' uses of a similar employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes'	ng EA, Essex LLFA).'
0207-0003	Individual	Richard	Smiten		Yes	B8	No	This B8 policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on MTE. This policy is not evidence based, but records show poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged	Not Stated	Not Stated			No		No		Policy B8 Manor Trading Estate The B8 policy is not evidence based, and officers have not engaged. CPBC's vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing 25% of its employment space	Manor Trading Estate: Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
								with the majority of the 120 businesses on the MTE. CBC vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing a 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CBC's Officers Mapping area the MTE is incorrect and misleads the public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.										for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as it has been previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CPBC’s Officers Mapping of the MTE is incorrect and misleads the public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic	floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured through the revised approach to design and parking.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.		
0 2 0 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ga vin	Cul f		Yes	B8	No	This B8 policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on MTE. This policy is not evidence based, but records show poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on the MTE. CBC vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing a 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CBC's Officers Mapping area the MTE is incorrect and misleads the	No t Sta ted	Not Stated			No		No		Not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. Has not considered all sites. Excluded the North West Thundersley site. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. NPPF states development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, and puts residents in the East at risk with	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2. All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). North west Thundersley was not preferred for reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons site not currently a preferred alternative for allocation) and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport	Y - Policy SD3(3) 'Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the constraints of the specific geographic location , site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.									emergency evacuation procedures. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. Object for proposals for residential on Charfleets	evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. SUDs: Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA. Charfleets: Charfleets Industrial Estate is included within Policy E1 which includes the statement 'the Council will seek to provide and retain Class E(g), B2 and B8 use classes	regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex, the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and recommendations/advice from statutory bodies (including EA, Essex LLFA).'

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		<i>or other 'sui generis' uses of a similar employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes'</i>	
0 2 0 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Pau line	Basf ord		Yes	B8	No	This B8 policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on MTE. This policy is not evidence based, but records show poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on the MTE. CBC vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing a 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise	No t Sta ted	Not Stated			No		No		This B8 policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on MTE. This policy is not evidence based, but records show poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on the MTE. CBC vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing a 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to	Manor Trading Estate: Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								complaints. CBC's Officers Mapping area the MTE is incorrect and misleads the public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.									Canvey employment zones, as previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CBC's Officers Mapping area the MTE is incorrect and misleads the public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor	commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured through the revised approach to design and parking.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.		
0 2 7 6 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Luk e	Alde n		Yes	B8	No	I am a local business on the Manor Trading Estate and have had a presence on the estate since 2006. 1st I record that I have had the opportunity to read and fully understand my neighbour "G&K Groundworks Ltd" Unsound submission. For clarity I attach a copy of G&Ks submission to this e-mail.	No	Not Stated	I record here that Manor Training Centre UK Ltd agree with G&K Groundworks Ltd.'s that the regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. For the record and as relayed in G&K Groundworks Ltd submission • CPBC have never engaged with me / my business about our future on this estate. • Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough • I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. I am certainly more confused now! Where am I going to be re-homed? This Regulation 19 along with the recent green belt review indicates that the area North where we are moving to has been identified as GB16 and has been discounted as it is not a viable! Option. I would like to record my total disbelief that CPBC along	Perhaps CPBC might remove that Regeneration Priority Frightening Statement and actually support the local business.	No		Yes, attached is G&K Groundworks ltd's response to the consultation		The regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. CPBC have never engaged with the business community on this estate. Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. Some Background G&K are the title owners of HMLR EX498233 the footprint is 1.22 ha just over 3 acre's which is except for connect packaging	Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											with our local councillors think it's OK to treat us the MTE business community with total disrespect. Suffice – I record again that this draft plan is unsound as it has not engaged with the business on the MTE at all. Albeit we are the drivers of the local economy.						the largest single commercial / industrial premises on the Manor Trading Estate. Benfleet Essex. (MTE) G&K houses 28 tenants, albeit CPBC are fully aware of those tenants & business as this draft document clearly states CPBC have engaged with them all. For the avoidance of doubt and I engage with all my tenants on a at least a weekly basis not one of them has had any engagement with CPBC officers, councillors nor CPBC co-opted Deyton Bell. Fact this property has warehousing & storage buildings along with separate offices and external yards • 10 units have a warehouse footprint of 2400sq ft along with attached offices of 600 sq. ft and associated attached yards of 1200 sq. ft • 3 Units of 1200 sq. ft with 300 sq. ft office & 600 sq. ft of	through the revised approach to design and parking.'	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	attached rear yard • It has 1 exceptionally large yard of over 20,000 sq. ft which is houses a significant 14 MW power station that feed the local grid. So, a significant contributor to the local economy. • It has 13 yards ranging from 1250 sq. ft to 5400 sq.ft. We are full to the brim. We continually must turn away enquiries for warehousing and offices. Aside from G&K Groundworks Ltd and its 28 tenants it appears from conversation with other business on the MTE they have not been engaged with. Yet this draft document along with the many website uploads. All indicate that our opinions are reflected in this draft plan. That is not true! Questions over consistency with CPBC Regeneration policies		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2 7 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ant hon y	Salt on	Cart ec Gar age Ltd	Yes	B8	No		No	Not Stated	I am a local business on the Manor Trading Estate and have had a presence on the estate for years. I record here that Cartec Garage Ltd agrees with G&K Groundworks Ltd that the regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. For the record and as relayed in G&K Groundworks Ltd submission 1. CPBC have never engaged with me / my business about our future on this estate. 2. Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough 3. I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all ! This is very worrying and concerning. I am certainly more confused now! Where am I going to be re-homed? This Regulation 19 along with the recent green belt review indicates that the area North where we are moving to, has been identified as GB16 and has been discounted as it is not a viable! Option. I would like to record my total disbelief that CPBC along with our local councillors think it's OK to treat us the MTE business		No		Yes, attached is G&K Groundworks ltd's response to the consultation		Our network does not extend to the Castle Point Plan area. The nearest access points to the SRN (M25 Junction 29 and Junction 30 and the A13/A1089 junction) are approximately 12 miles from the Castle Point boundary, via the A127 and A13 respectively. Given the locations of the development, we anticipate that much of the traffic generated would be contained within the Castle Point boundary and the surrounding area. Whilst it is unlikely that the development would generate significant new trips on the A13 and M25, we note that Policy C5 is focused on improving access to and around Canvey Island. It is acknowledged that the A13 and A130 are key access points into Canvey Island and that the junctions and a feasibility study will be carried out to	Comments noted	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											community with total disrespect. Suffice – I record again that this draft plan is unsound as it has not engaged with the business on the MTE at all. Albeit we are the drivers of the local economy. Perhaps CPBC might remove that Regeneration Priority Frightening Statement and actually support the local business						identify their options for improving access to, from and within Canvey Island, including its wider strategic implications. Some key collaboration partners are identified although National Highways is not mentioned specifically.		
0288-0001	Individual	Noah	Anwo	Debyet Tradings Ltd	Yes	B8	No	I am a local business on the Manor Trading Estate and have had a presence on the estate since 2006. 1st I record that I have had the opportunity to read and fully understand my neighbour “G&K Groundworks Ltd” Unsound submission. For clarity I attach a copy of G&Ks submission to this e-mail.	No	Not Stated	I record here that Manor Training Centre UK Ltd agree with G&K Groundworks Ltd.'s that the regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. For the record and as relayed in G&K Groundworks Ltd submission • CPBC have never engaged with me / my business about our future on this estate. • Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough • I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. I am certainly more confused now! Where am I going to be re-homed? This Regulation 19 along with the recent green belt review indicates	Perhaps CPBC might remove that Regeneration Priority Frightening Statement and actually support the local business.	No		Yes, attached is G&K Groundworks ltd's response to the consultation		The regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. CPBC have never engaged with the business community on Manor Trading Estate. Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning.	Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											that the area North where we are moving to has been identified as GB16 and has been discounted as it is not a viable! Option. I would like to record my total disbelief that CPBC along with our local councillors think it's OK to treat us the MTE business community with total disrespect. Suffice – I record again that this draft plan is unsound as it has not engaged with the business on the MTE at all. Albeit we are the drivers of the local economy.						Some Background G&K are the title owners of HMLR EX498233 the footprint is 1.22 ha just over 3 acre's which is except for connect packaging the largest single commercial / industrial premises on the Manor Trading Estate. Benfleet Essex. (MTE) G&K houses 28 tenants, albeit CPBC are fully aware of those tenants & business as this draft document clearly states CPBC have engaged with them all. For the avoidance of doubt and I engage with all my tenants on a at least a weekly basis not one of them has had any engagement with CPBC officers, councillors nor CPBC co-opted Deyton Bell. Fact this property has warehousing & storage buildings along with separate offices and external yards • 10 units have a warehouse footprint of 2400sq ft along	commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured through the revised approach to design and parking.'	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	with attached offices of 600 sq. ft and associated attached yards of 1200 sq. ft • 3 Units of 1200 sq. ft with 300 sq. ft office & 600 sq. ft of attached rear yard • It has 1 exceptionally large yard of over 20,000 sq. ft which is houses a significant 14 MW power station that feed the local grid. So, a significant contributor to the local economy. • It has 13 yards ranging from 1250 sq. ft to 5400 sq.ft. We are full to the brim. We continually must turn away enquiries for warehousing and offices. Aside from G&K Groundworks Ltd and its 28 tenants it appears from conversation with other business on the MTE they have not been engaged with. Yet this draft document along with the many website uploads. All indicate that our opinions are reflected in this draft plan. That is		

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	not true! Questions over consistency with CPBC Regeneration policies		
0823-0010	Organisation	Pat	Abbott	Environment Agency	Yes	B8	Yes		No	Justified	We note that parts of site B8 (Manor Trading Estate) are located in an area, shown by the current Flood Map for Planning, as falling within Flood Zone's 2 and 3 (below left). Prior to the 25th March 2025, the Flood Map for Planning showed the site lying wholly within Flood Zone 1 (see below right) FMfP (post-25th March 2025) FMfP (pre-25th March 2025) Unfortunately, the Level 1 SFRA has relied on the understanding of Flood Zones from the pre-March 2025 Flood Map for Planning which showed that the entirety of this site was previously understood to lie entirely in Flood Zone 1 and the LPA has not re-evaluated its SFRA or site evaluations since the updated Flood Map		No	Not Answered		A	The EA referred to the New National Flood Risk Assessment in their response to the Regulation 19 Public Consultation to the Castle Point Plan. It was noted that flood extents at two site allocation sites (Site B7A-Richmond Avenue car park and Site B8 Manor Trading Estate) had changed as a result of the NaFRA2 modelling.	It is agreed that policy B7A and B8 has been updated to reflect the New National Flood Risk Assessment and be re-evaluated. The SFRA has been updated to take account of the New National Flood Risk Assessment and Sites B7A and B8 have been re-evaluated to ensure that the Sustainability Appraisal and Sequential	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											for Planning (March 2025). We would recommend that the Council reviews this site allocation by providing an updated SFRA Level 2 site evaluation to provide site-specific recommendations on the siting of residential and commercial development. This should take a Sequential Approach to the location of “more vulnerable” development to areas of the site that are at the lowest risk of flooding and making suitable text amendments to the site policy that would direct any housing development to be sited outside of the areas understood to be within Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the boundaries of the site.							Test are properly considered, and Level 2 SFRA site assessment has been updated for both sites.	
0 2 8 2 - 0 0 1 6	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	B8	Not Sta ted		No	Effective	ECC seek Criteria 4 also makes reference to providing biodiversity net gain to be consistent with other plan policies.	ECC require Criteria 4 is amended to read: Improved public realm which creates space for pedestrians and cyclists to move around. The public realm strategy should integrate urban greening, biodiversity net gain and incorporate sustainable drainage into the approach to materials and landscaping.	Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie d 8 addi ton al app endi ces con taini ng vari ous piec es of evid	B	Reference should be made to providing biodiversity net gain for this policy	Accepted and additional text added requiring biodiversity net gain	4. Improve d public realm which creates space for pedestri ans and cyclists to move around. The public realm strategy should integrate urban greening ,

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
															enc e				biodiver sity net gain and incorpor ate sustaina ble drainage into the approac h to material s and landsca ping 8. Develop ment proposal s must be designed to protect and enhance ~~enable~~ and ~~support~~ the habitat priority measure s identifie d within the Strategic Opportu nities set out in the Essex Local

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			Nature Recover y Strategy (LNRS).
0 3 1 0 - 0 0 0 7	Individual	Mar tin	Engl and		Yes	B8			No	Justified, consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development		Yes	As Hea d of the Sav e Had leig h Far mla nd Gro up I wou ld like to put the cas e for war d as to why our site is still at risk with a loc al pla n that	No	A	Policy B8 Manor Trading Estates (MTE) inclusion as a brownfield site for development into a mixed use housing and industrial area has not fully considered the impact on micro, small, medium and large businesses currently operating on the estate that are currently renting property or own their own site, there is no assessment of how they will be able to operationally or financially continue to operate, should they be forced to move to new premises or have restrictions placed on their existing operations in the future, due to the proximity of new residential properties.	Manor Trading Estate: Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured through the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. The inclusion of the Manor Trading Estate (MTE) as a brownfield site for development into a mixed use housing and industrial area has not fully considered the impact on micro, small, medium and large businesses currently operating on the estate that are currently renting property or own their own site, there is no assessment of how they will be able to operationally or financially continue to operate, should they be forced to move to new premises or have restrictions placed on their existing operations in the future, due to the proximity of new residential properties.			will be found unsound, which will then lead to speculative development across our precious Greenbelt sites. Also, the over development with this pla				revised approach to design and parking.'	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											This B8 policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on MTE. The B8 Policy for MTE will result in restricted economic growth, reduction in protected employment area, unemployment, force business to move to Canvey, and housing over employment is not an option. This policy is not evidence based, but records show poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on the MTE. CPBC vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing a 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CPBC's Officers Mapping area the MTE is incorrect and misleads the			n will cau se unt old issu es to the loc al urb an are as, whe n ther e are viab le site s avai labl e whi ch hav e not bee n seri ousl y con side red, like NW Thu nde					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways, and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.			rsley. Also, as a Committee Member for the Friends of Canvey Lake group I would like to put the case forward as to why our lake is still at risk with this pla					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														n that put s ove r thre e tho usa nds hou ses on Can vey Isla nd, but whe n fou nd uns oun d, will lea d to spe cul ativ e dev elo pm ent acr oss our pre cio us Gre enb					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														elt site s, with the add itio nal hou ses on our Gre y Belt site s on Can vey, whe n ther e are viab le site s avai labl e whi ch hav e not bee n seri ousl y con side red, like					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														NW Thu nde rsle y.					
0336-0013	Organisati on	Car olin e	Pete rs	Esse x Poli ce		B8	Not Sta ted	The DOCO notes the redevelopment of the Manor Trading Estate, and the requirement to optimise urban land use and improve the quality of the urban environment and public realm. Thought should be given to the current location and other parcels of Urban Land to identify what measures could be required from a safety and security perspective. Further to the Regulation 19 Draft Plan Stakeholder Workshop, we would welcome the opportunity to influence the design of Urban Land. Such engagement will help identify features within the								A	Welcome the opportunity to influence the design of Urban Land. Engagement will help identify features within the built environment that be designed out and assist in the creation of further planning objectives on this matter.	Consultation with the police alongside compliance with policy D1 will be implemented.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								built environment that be designed out and assist in the creation of further planning objectives on this matter.											
0 3 4 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Wa rre n	Smit h	G&K Gro und work s		B8		This submission is by and on behalf of G & K Groundworks Ltd, we consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft is NOT compliant, is therefore Unsound and should not be taken forward nor presented to the inspectorate as indications are it will fail the test of soundness. Which will lead to significant delays in producing a new compliant plan whilst doing so cost an excessive sum, especially when one accounts this wasted expenditure, whilst at the same time leave business's in a position of doubt surrounding their future. Some Background G&K are the title owners of HMLR EX498233 the footprint is 1.22 ha just over 3 acre's which is except for connect packaging the largest single commercial / industrial premises on the Manor Trading Estate. Benfleet Essex. (MTE) G&K houses 28 tenants, albeit CPBC are fully aware of those tenants & business as this draft document clearly states CPBC have engaged with them all. For the avoidance of doubt and I engage with all my tenants on a at least a weekly basis	No	Not Stated	G&K Groundworks Ltd who are a significant landlord on the MTE do not consider the CPBC's Regulation 19 Draft to be Sound. Quite simply this draft Local Plan has already put a question mark over the future of any business be they existing ones that have been here for years or any new venture that might have considered bringing new business and employment to Castle Point & Specifically Benfleet It quite simply fails the tests of soundness on the very basic failure to consult. You have not consulted with: - 1) The businesses on the MTE individually or collectively. Similarly, I have it on good authority that CPBC officers, councillor nor specialist business consultants have not engaged or consulted in any format with the owners of the private road & path network. I take this opportunity to advise that I am quite prepared to participate in any inspector examination. I am happy that my name will be published alongside my comments to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 consultation.					B	<u>Manor Trading Estate</u> Object to both the policy (particularly perception of partail replavement with residential) and the level of engagement to inform it.	<u>Manor Trading Estate</u> Noted Manor Trading Estate is included within Policy E1 which includes the statement ' the Council will seek to provide and retain Class E(g), B2 and B8 use classes or other 'sui generis' uses of a similar employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes'	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
								not one of them has had any engagement with CPBC officers, councillors nor CPBC co-opted Deyton Bell. Fact this property has warehousing & storage buildings along with separate offices and external yards • 10 units have a warehouse footprint of 2400sq ft along with attached offices of 600 sq. ft and associated attached yards of 1200 sq. ft • 3 Units of 1200 sq. ft with 300 sq. ft office & 600 sq. ft of attached rear yard • It has 1 exceptionally large yard of over 20,000 sq. ft which is houses a significant 14 MW power station that feed the local grid. So, a significant contributor to the local economy. • It has 13 yards ranging from 1250 sq. ft to 5400 sq.ft. We are full to the brim. We continually must turn away enquiries for warehousing and offices. Aside from G&K Groundworks Ltd and its 28 tenants it appears from conversation with other business on the MTE they have not been engaged with. Yet this draft document along with the many website uploads. All indicate that our opinions are reflected in this draft plan. That is not true! Fact: Local plans should be evidence driven. Where might the records of the engagement with local			Please acknowledge receipt of my submission.									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								business be! I believe that CPBC might have some difficulty in producing that evidence to the inspector if this ever gets to that milestone. Without auditable evidence the plan will fail. That said it will more than likely get through this stage, simply because 99% of the respondents to the consultation are a specific demographic who like those councillors are of a certain age and or demographic who gained their seats on a promise to protect the Green Belt. Significantly that results in them devastating the future the local business's that drive the local economy. There are significant other contradictory statement surrounding the draft plan. Which quite remarkably if taken in context indicate that CPBC its officers and councillors do not actually take the time even at this late stage to reflect on the true opinions of the local business's FOR INSTANCE, this is FACT same councillors who voted through this Reg 19 on 23rd July 25 were advised on 21st July, 2 days before they unanimously voted it through. Thus, were made fully aware of what was on the council's main regeneration page! They consciously ignored that											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								information! They didn't even have the integrity intelligence to relay the same to the officers. That they might get that business destroying page removed. Below is an indication that our council are in complete disarray. The web page I refer is at this link Regeneration Priorities CastlePoint V.A.T. Reg No.690 8009 25 Registered Office: 376 London Road, Hadleigh, Essex. SS7 2DA Director: G.P. Smith Company Secretary: N.D. Smith Co.Reg No.3331126 Aside from G&K Groundworks Ltd and its 28 tenants it appears from conversation with other business on the MTE they have not been engaged with. Yet this draft document along with the many website uploads. All indicate that our opinions are reflected in this draft plan. That is not true! Fact: Local plans should be evidence driven. Where might the records of the engagement with local business be! I believe that CPBC might have some difficulty in producing that evidence to the inspector if this ever gets to that milestone. Without auditable evidence the plan will fail. That said it will more than likely get through this stage, simply because 99% of the											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								respondents to the consultation are a specific demographic who like those councillors are of a certain age and or demographic who gained their seats on a promise to protect the Green Belt. Significantly that results in them devastating the future the local business’s that drive the local economy. There are significant other contradictory statement surrounding the draft plan. Which quite remarkably if taken in context indicate that CPBC its officers and councillors do not actually take the time even at this late stage to reflect on the true opinions of the local business’s FOR INSTANCE, this is FACT same councillors who voted through this Reg 19 on 23rd July 25 were advised on 21st July, 2 days before they unanimously voted it through. Thus, were made fully aware of what was on the council’s main regeneration page! They consciously ignored that information! They didn’t even have the integrity intelligence to relay the same to the officers. That they might get that business destroying page removed. Below is an indication that our council are in complete disarray. The web page I refer is at this link Regeneration Priorities											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
								CastlePoint . It clearly says the 4th Regeneration priority is to redevelop the MTE to housing. It further informs we the business’s will be moving North of the Borough. No matter how many times they have been notified of the above the last being in a submission of Yesterday 24th Sept 25 that same statement is on the web today. For the Avoidance of Doubt, I have at appendix 1 to this unsound notification letter taken a snapshot of that page which includes the date & time it was drawn down. Further indication that perhaps CPBC are in disarray, perhaps they thought we the business had been engaged with, albeit they never visited, be that by visiting & introducing themselves, by direct letter or email contact to each & every business which of course will be available as auditable evidence! It is possible that they think the engagement was through CPBC’s web-based Business forum page. That link is here Castle Point Business Forum CastlePoint The snapshot below, is from today 25/09/25 at 16.27 Hrs. It is, as it was in July when I first informed councillors who voted the draft through!													

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								It is, as it was in August & Yesterday the 24th September; Not Live, Not Operational & has not been operational since at the very latest Dec 2023! 1. There are other significant anomalies The same council officers and councillors have allowed to go unchecked 1. One document suggests only 25% (the western side of the MTE is to be used for housing. 2. Another indicates the whole of the MTE is to be used for housing 3. Remarkable both suggest 200 residential units! 4. One document suggest the MTE is 14.5 Hectares it isn't its 12.5. But significantly though CPBC based that officers and councillors have engaged with the whole of the Estate you would have thought one of them might have picked up that MTE is privately owned and that the commercial / industrial properties on the ECC highway known as Church Road are not nor have ever been part of the MTE. They are NOT. 5. Apparently as the regeneration priority Nr 4 we are still moving to the North of the borough! The only conclusion we come to is CPBC are still going to move us to that "North of the borough" location which CPBC identified as GB16 in											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								the consultation process. YET This same council produced this Reg 19 document for committee in July in that document they discounted GB16. They appear to substantiate that rejection by producing an after the event Green Belt Review in August that relayed that GB16 was not supported by any Statutory Authority, I / we can only presume those consultees included: - Highways, NHS, Police, EA, Telecoms, Gas & Electric. Perhaps they have and will supply the inspector with that evidence.											

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0270001	Organisation	Andy	Coombes	Manor Training Centre UK Ltd	Yes	B8	No	I am a local business on the Manor Trading Estate and have had a presence on the estate since 2006. 1st I record that I have had the opportunity to read and fully understand my neighbour "G&K Groundworks Ltd" Unsound submission. For clarity I attach a copy of G&Ks submission to this e-mail.	No	Not Stated	I record here that Manor Training Centre UK Ltd agree with G&K Groundworks Ltd.'s that the regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. For the record and as relayed in G&K Groundworks Ltd submission • CPBC have never engaged with me / my business about our future on this estate. • Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough • I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. I am certainly more confused now! Where am I going to be re-homed? This Regulation 19 along with the recent green belt review indicates that the area North where we are moving to has been identified as GB16 and has been discounted as it is not a viable! Option. I would like to record my total disbelief that CPBC along with our local councillors think it's OK to treat us the MTE business community with total disrespect. Suffice – I record again that this draft plan is unsound as it has not engaged with the	Perhaps CPBC might remove that Regeneration Priority Frightening Statement and actually support the local business.	No		Yes, attached is G&K Groundworks ltd's response to the consultation		The regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. CPBC have never engaged with the business community on this estate. Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. Some Background G&K are the title owners of HMLR EX498233 the footprint is 1.22 ha just over 3 acre's which is except for connect packaging the largest single commercial / industrial premises on the Manor Trading Estate. Benfleet Essex. (MTE)	Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured through the revised approach to design and parking.'	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											business on the MTE at all. Albeit we are the drivers of the local economy.						G&K houses 28 tenants, albeit CPBC are fully aware of those tenants & business as this draft document clearly states CPBC have engaged with them all. For the avoidance of doubt and I engage with all my tenants on a at least a weekly basis not one of them has had any engagement with CPBC officers, councillors nor CPBC co-opted Deyton Bell. Fact this property has warehousing & storage buildings along with separate offices and external yards • 10 units have a warehouse footprint of 2400sq ft along with attached offices of 600 sq. ft and associated attached yards of 1200 sq. ft • 3 Units of 1200 sq. ft with 300 sq. ft office & 600 sq. ft of attached rear yard • It has 1 exceptionally large yard of over 20,000 sq. ft which is houses a significant 14 MW power		

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	station that feed the local grid. So, a significant contributor to the local economy. • It has 13 yards ranging from 1250 sq. ft to 5400 sq.ft. We are full to the brim. We continually must turn away enquiries for warehousing and offices. Aside from G&K Groundworks Ltd and its 28 tenants it appears from conversation with other business on the MTE they have not been engaged with. Yet this draft document along with the many website uploads. All indicate that our opinions are reflected in this draft plan. That is not true! Questions over consistency with CPBC Regeneration policies		
0656-0002	Individual	Steven	McGregor		Yes	B8	Yes		Yes				No	Not Answered	Yes - See attachments		Policy B8 is sound and legally compliant	Support noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 4 4 0 - 0 0 1 0	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	B8	Yes		No	Justified	We suggest more detail can be provided around urban biodiversity enhancements.	Policy B8 can be improved by including: Brownfield habitat within the development; green roofs, sandy planted areas/sandbanks, use of waste material such as crushed concrete in gabion baskets are examples of this; Small additions; Swift boxes, sandy flower beds with well though through planting for pollinators, some green roofs on large retails units, increased tree and shrub cover where appropriate; The Beth Chatto housing estate can be used as a possible model – dry gardens with planting of native (and potentially non-native) plants.	No				Suggest more detail can be provided around urban biodiversity enhancements. Policy B8 can be improved by including: Brownfield habitat within the development; green roofs, sandy planted areas/sandbanks, use of waste material such as crushed concrete in gabion baskets are examples of this; Small additions; Swift boxes, sandy flower beds with well though through planting for pollinators, some green roofs on large retails units, increased tree and shrub cover where appropriate; The Beth Chatto housing estate can be used as a possible model – dry gardens with planting of native (and potentially non-native) plants.	More detailed matters of site managementt can be drawn out in the master plan. Swift boxes already covered by Policy ENV5	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2 7 1 - 0 0 0 1	Organisati on	Ste phe n	Travi s	S&S Vehi cle Serv ices	Yes	B8	No		No	Not Stated	We are a local business on the Manor Trading Estate and have had a presence on the estate for years. 1st I record that I have had the opportunity to read and fully understand my neighbour “G&K Groundworks Ltd” Unsound submission. For clarity I attach a copy of G&Ks submission to this e-mail. I record that S&S Vehicle Services agree with G&K Groundworks Ltd.’s in that the regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. As relayed in G&K Groundworks Ltd submission 1. CPBC have never engaged with us at S&S about our future of this estate. 2. Have never informed us, as is on the council’s regeneration web page at priority Nr 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough 3. I presume CPBC intends to Compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. We are certainly more confused now! Where are we going to be re-homed? This Reg 19 along with the recent green belt review indicates that the area North where we are moving to has been identified as GB16 and has		No		Yes, attached is G&K Groundworks ltd's response to the consultation		The regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. CPBC have never engaged with the business community on Manor Trading Estate. Have never informed as is on the council’s regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. Some Background G&K are the title owners of HMLR EX498233 the footprint is 1.22 ha just over 3 acre’s which is except for connect packaging the largest single commercial / industrial premises on the Manor Trading Estate. Benfleet Essex.	Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured through the revised approach to design and parking.'	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											been discounted as it is not a viable! option. I would like to record my total disbelief that CPBC along with our local councillors think it’s OK to treat us the MTE business community with total disrespect. Suffice – I record again that this draft plan is unsound as it has not engaged with the business on the MTE at all. Albeit we are the drivers of the local economy. Perhaps CPBC might remove that Regeneration Priority Frightening Statement and actually support the local business.						(MTE) G&K houses 28 tenants, albeit CPBC are fully aware of those tenants & business as this draft document clearly states CPBC have engaged with them all. For the avoidance of doubt and I engage with all my tenants on a at least a weekly basis not one of them has had any engagement with CPBC officers, councillors nor CPBC co-opted Deyton Bell. Fact this property has warehousing & storage buildings along with separate offices and external yards • 10 units have a warehouse footprint of 2400sq ft along with attached offices of 600 sq. ft and associated attached yards of 1200 sq. ft • 3 Units of 1200 sq. ft with 300 sq. ft office & 600 sq. ft of attached rear yard • It has 1 exceptionally large yard of over 20,000 sq. ft which is houses a significant		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	14 MW power station that feed the local grid. So, a significant contributor to the local economy. It has 13 yards ranging from 1250 sq. ft to 5400 sq.ft. We are full to the brim. We continually must turn away enquiries for warehousing and offices. Aside from G&K Groundworks Ltd and its 28 tenants it appears from conversation with other business on the MTE they have not been engaged with. Yet this draft document along with the many website uploads. All indicate that our opinions are reflected in this draft plan. That is not true! Questions over consistency with CPBC Regeneration policies		

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1025-008	Individual	Martin	England		Yes	B8	No	The draft plan is not legally compliant as it fails to consider strategic alternatives, like North West Thundersley, which has been excluded, the Biodiversity and environmental protection needs strengthening, there is no credible five-year housing land supply and a lack of evidence on cross-boundary infrastructure with a duty to cooperate. The policy of not building on the Greenbelt is biased and predetermined.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. Co It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites across the borough,	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Add the Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites of Kings Park HO31. Add the Greenbelt site of Land East of Manor Trading S0145 SHLAA 2018. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Benfleet at 347, Thundersley at 643, and Hadleigh at 305, keeping Existing Commitments 480, and Windfall Allowance 675. Total housing target of 11,000 Remove Manor Trading Industrial Estate site from the plan.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Concern for the businesses currently operating at manor trading estate Lack of engagement with businesses Forcing businesses onto canvey Innaccurate mapping as MTE is 12.5ha not 14ha Not suitable for housing	Businesses in operation The purpose of policy B8 is not to remove employment opportunities from the borough, it is a way to bring investment and regeneration to an area of which the urban environment could be improved. The allocation specifies a requirement of at least 10% increase in industrial and commercial building floor space. It does not intent for the loss of jobs, buisnesses or buisness commercial spaces. The purpose of this allocation is not to relocate any businesses. Lack of engagement with buisnesses	Policy B8 Page 63 insert map to be updated to reflect policy map (removing 4 bungalows in the south west corner).

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. The inclusion of the Manor Trading Estate (MTE) as a brownfield site for development into a mixed use housing and industrial area has not fully considered the impact on micro, small, medium and large businesses currently operating on the estate that are currently renting property or own their own site, there is no assessment of how they will be able to operationally or financially continue to operate, should they be forced to move to new premises or have restrictions placed on their existing operations in the future, due to the proximity of new residential properties. This B8 policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on MTE. The B8 Policy for MTE will result in restricted economic growth, reduction in protected employment area,													The owner of the site submitted the land through the call for sites. If an application for development is submitted to the council the buisnesses will all be consulted. Further to this there have been multiple consultations on the Castle Point Plan where anyone has been welcome to comment. Please see the consultation statements for more information on how these were publicised. Innacurate mapping Comments noted. A modification will be added to update the insert map on page 63 to reflect the policies map which	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											unemployment, force business to move to Canvey, and housing over employment is not an option. This policy is not evidence based, but records show poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority of the 120 businesses on the MTE. CPBC vision is to create an environment that promotes business on MTE, by removing a 25% of its employment space for housing. This vision will mean MTE businesses will be forced to move to Canvey employment zones, as previously suggested that any increase in commercial / industrial area could be accommodated on Canvey. ECC will relay objections in that any residential units near protected facilities will undoubtedly increase noise complaints. CPBC’s Officers Mapping area the MTE is incorrect and misleads the public, as MTE is a max of 12.5 Ha and not the 14 Ha stated, as it does not include the properties which all front Church Road. The MTE Road & footways network is privately owned, so who will fund the new roads, footways and cycle paths across private land. The future plans for Manor Trading Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full								excludes the four bungalows fronting onto church road. The 14ha of employment land is still accurate as this is solely a measurement for employment land. Housing suitability Policy B8 requires a masterplan to ensure that the location of housing within the site is suitable and ensures that residential amenity is not impacted.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Manor Trading Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.								
0 2 8 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Mer tuz a	Mer cha nt	t Rida Lon don Ltd T/A Urb an Blaz e	Yes	B8	No	I am a local business on the Manor Trading Estate and have had a presence on the estate since 2006. 1st I record that I have had the opportunity to read and fully understand my neighbour "G&K Groundworks Ltd" Unsound submission. For clarity I attach a copy of G&Ks submission to this e-mail.	No	Not Stated	I record here that Manor Training Centre UK Ltd agree with G&K Groundworks Ltd.'s that the regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. For the record and as relayed in G&K Groundworks Ltd submission • CPBC have never engaged with me / my business about our future on this estate. • Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough • I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my	Perhaps CPBC might remove that Regeneration Priority Frightening Statement and actually support the local business.	No		Yes, attached is G&K Groundworks ltd's response to the consultation		The regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. CPBC have never engaged with the business community on this estate. Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough I presume CPBC intends to	Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. I am certainly more confused now! Where am I going to be re-homed? This Regulation 19 along with the recent green belt review indicates that the area North where we are moving to has been identified as GB16 and has been discounted as it is not a viable! Option. I would like to record my total disbelief that CPBC along with our local councillors think it's OK to treat us the MTE business community with total disrespect. Suffice – I record again that this draft plan is unsound as it has not engaged with the business on the MTE at all. Albeit we are the drivers of the local economy.						compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. Some Background G&K are the title owners of HMLR EX498233 the footprint is 1.22 ha just over 3 acre's which is except for connect packaging the largest single commercial / industrial premises on the Manor Trading Estate. Benfleet Essex. (MTE) G&K houses 28 tenants, albeit CPBC are fully aware of those tenants & business as this draft document clearly states CPBC have engaged with them all. For the avoidance of doubt and I engage with all my tenants on a at least a weekly basis not one of them has had any engagement with CPBC officers, councillors nor CPBC co-opted Deyton Bell. Fact this property has warehousing &	on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured through the revised approach to design and parking.'	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	storage buildings along with separate offices and external yards • 10 units have a warehouse footprint of 2400sq ft along with attached offices of 600 sq. ft and associated attached yards of 1200 sq. ft • 3 Units of 1200 sq. ft with 300 sq. ft office & 600 sq. ft of attached rear yard • It has 1 exceptionally large yard of over 20,000 sq. ft which is houses a significant 14 MW power station that feed the local grid. So, a significant contributor to the local economy. • It has 13 yards ranging from 1250 sq. ft to 5400 sq.ft. We are full to the brim. We continually must turn away enquiries for warehousing and offices. Aside from G&K Groundworks Ltd and its 28 tenants it appears from conversation with other business on the MTE they have not been engaged with. Yet this draft		

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	document along with the many website uploads. All indicate that our opinions are reflected in this draft plan. That is not true! Questions over consistency with CPBC Regeneration policies		
02680001	Organisation	Michelle	Smith	The Warehouse Bar	Yes	B8	No	I am a local business on the Manor Trading Estate and have had a presence on the estate for years. 1st I record that I have had the opportunity to read and fully understand my neighbour "G&K Groundworks Ltd" Unsound submission. For clarity I attach a copy of G&Ks submission to this e-mail. I record here that The Warehouse Bar agree with G&K Groundworks Ltd.'s that the regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. For the record and as relayed in G&K Groundworks Ltd submission • CPBC have never engaged with me / my business about our future on this estate. • Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading	No	Not Stated	Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. I am certainly more confused now! Where am I going to be re-homed? This Regulation 19 along with the recent green belt review indicates that the area North where we are moving to has been identified as GB16 and has been discounted as it is not a viable! Option. I would like to record my total disbelief that CPBC along with our local councillors think it's OK to treat us the MTE business community with total disrespect. Suffice – I record again that this draft plan is unsound as it has not engaged with the business on the MTE at all. Albeit we are the drivers of the local economy. Perhaps CPBC might remove that Regeneration Priority Frightening Statement and		No	Not Stated	Yes, attached is G&K Groundworks ltd's response to the consultation		The regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. CPBC have never engaged with the business community on this estate. Have never informed as is on the council's regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this	Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%' Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough • I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property!			actually support the local business. Please ensure that this unsound submission is recorded and registered correctly.						is very worrying and concerning.	floor space available for industrial and commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured through the revised approach to design and parking.'	
0 3 3 6 - 0 0 1 4	Organisati on	Car olin e	Pete rs	Esse x Poli ce		B9	Not Sta ted	It is recognised that the playing fields have been identified on the Master Plan as multi-functional green. It is essential all green space is designed to be safe and inclusive for all to use and enjoy. It is advised community facilities are designed to be safe and inclusive, this will support in the prevention of crime and ASB, while allowing all users to feel included within the proposed facilities				The DOCO would also like to draw your attention to the 'Make Space For Girls' campaign, (www.makespaceforgirls.co.uk/about-us); this initiative aims to incorporate the observations and opinions of teenage girls into the design and development of new and old play spaces. This is to ensure that spaces are inclusive and safe for female users. "We are working on a range of projects which improve parks and other outdoor spaces in order to support opportunities for teenage girls and improve their mental and physical well-being and their access to public space. We collaborate with a wide range of institutions, including universities, health trusts, councils, and developers to create change."				A	It is advised community facilities are designed to be safe and inclusive, this will support in the prevention of crime and ASB, while allowing all users to feel included within the proposed facilities	This site will be assessed under policy D1 which includes opportunities for design out crime to be taken	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0834-0001	Individual	Gary	Luckman		Yes	B9	No	Failed to consider using a section of the top/north part of the playing fields to build new community facilities in the heart of South Benfleet, such as Doctors, Dentist/NHS reach facilities, either to increase capacity of these facilities or to replace existing old sites which would be freed up for housing.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Freeing up some of the playing fields may not impact significantly on available useable space, nor will it hinder the councils plans to increase Biodiversity and accessibility of the playing fields.		No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Allocate some of the playing fields (B9) for community facilities	Policy B9 intends for the space to be masterplanned with the support for use of the site for recreational/and or community purposes and other ancillary buildings provided as appropriate.	N
1440-0009	Organisation	Joe Seph	Beale	RSPB	Yes	B9	Yes		No	Justified	There are several positive points in this Policy, such as increased biodiversity and wildlife corridors. However, there is a risk of 'species rich' grassland that will be used, and nutrient-enriched, by dogs more than wildlife, or general non-native shrub planting. Given the importance of South Benfleet as an area with potential to provide connectivity following the principles of the Essex LNRS, it could be explained in Policy how these aims will be achieved whilst subject to recreational pressures.	It should be clarified how native scrub and low-nutrient grassland corridors will be enhanced or created, and how this can realistically function alongside areas with high densities of dogs. If this can be done, there is an excellent opportunity to enhance connectivity and biodiversity in this area. Paragraph b.36 is welcome. To increase flood storage, Castle Point can create ponds in existing low points on the site and connect with long grassland buffer zones.	No				There are several positive points in this Policy, such as increased biodiversity and wildlife corridors. However, there is a risk of 'species rich' grassland that will be used, and nutrient-enriched, by dogs more than wildlife, or general non-native shrub planting. Given the importance of South Benfleet as an area with potential to provide connectivity following the principles of the Essex LNRS, it could be explained in Policy how these aims will be achieved whilst subject to recreational pressures.	More detailed matters of site managementt can be drawn out in the master plan. Point 3 of Policy B9 already addresses flood storage <i>I't should be clarified how native scrub and low-nutrient grassland corridors will be enhanced or created, and how this can realistically function alongside areas with high densities of dogs. If this</i>	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	It should be clarified how native scrub and low-nutrient grassland corridors will be enhanced or created, and how this can realistically function alongside areas with high densities of dogs. If this can be done, there is an excellent opportunity to enhance connectivity and biodiversity in this area. Paragraph b.36 is welcome. To increase flood storage, Castle Point can create ponds in existing low points on the site and connect with long grassland buffer zones.	<i>can be done, there is an excellent opportunity to enhance connectivity and biodiversity in this area. Paragraph b.36 is welcome. To increase flood storage, Castle Point can create ponds in existing low points on the site and connect with long grassland buffer zones.'</i>	
0738-0006	Organisation	Roy	Warren	Sport England	Yes	B9	Yes		Yes		The principle of masterplanning South Benfleet Playing Fields as a multi-functional green space is welcomed as this would encourage sport and physical activity to take place. Criterion 5 is particularly welcomed as it will help ensure that the existing playing pitches which make an important contribution to its multi-functional role are not lost or prejudiced by future proposals. This would be consistent with Government policy in paragraph 104 of the NPPF.		No	Not Answered		A	Supports B9 for the redevelopment of South Benfleet Playing fields to create a multifunctional green space without overall loss of existing playing pitch provision.	Support noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1013-0003	Organisation	Tessa	Saunders	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Yes	C1	Yes		Yes		Anglian Water supports the policy requirements, and considers the policy sound in principle, regarding town centre greening and managing flood risk through urban greening, water capture schemes and appropriate use of materials. Anglian Water has been involved in partnership schemes to retrofit SuDS in Canvey to address surface water flood risk in the town, and therefore we consider that future growth and redevelopment of sites in the town should include appropriate SuDS through urban greening to provide overall betterment for the existing community. These types of schemes can provide additional opportunities for regeneration including enhanced public realm, positive health and wellbeing benefits, improving biodiversity and air quality. Anglian Water would welcome engagement in the preparation of the Canvey Town Centre Master Plan to assist with the appropriate management of surface water, following the drainage hierarchy.	Anglian Water recommends that the policy should identify the need for SuDS (consistent with Policy SD3), particularly nature-based solutions such as rain gardens. The Urban Greening Scenario set out in the SFRA Surface Water Modelling Technical Note identifies that the potential impact of SuDS interventions could result in 10% reduction in contributing flows from the urban drainage network. Although this is not seen to have a significant impact on flood risk in Canvey Island, we would welcome further investigation on what measures would benefit the area.	No	Not Answered		A	Anglian Water supports the policy requirements, and considers the policy sound in principle, regarding town centre greening and managing flood risk through urban greening, water capture schemes and appropriate use of materials. Anglian Water has been involved in partnership schemes to retrofit SuDS in Canvey to address surface water flood risk in the town, and therefore we consider that future growth and redevelopment of sites in the town should include appropriate SuDS through urban greening to provide overall betterment for the existing community. These types of schemes can provide additional opportunities for regeneration including enhanced public realm, positive health and wellbeing benefits, improving biodiversity and air quality. Anglian	Policy SD3 requires all new development to incorporate water management measures to reduce surface water run-off or adverse impact on water quality and ensure that it does not increase flood risk elsewhere. Policy SD3 also states that the principal method to do so should be the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Supporting paragraph 21.37 states that 'Well-designed SuDS can contribute significantly towards the urban greening factor requirements set out in policy ENV3	Policy C1 - Canvey Town Centre Amendment to Part 11 The inclusion of appropriate SuDs to manage surface water flood risk in the town, to provide betterment for the community via urban Opportunities for managing flood risk through greening , water capture schemes and the appropriate use of materials to

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	Water would welcome engagement in the preparation of the Canvey Town Centre Master Plan to assist with the appropriate management of surface water, following the drainage hierarchy.	SuDS can also contribute to climate change adaption and water efficiency, through provision of rainwater harvesting to assist in water capture to reducing risk of flooding and reduce water demand’.Policy C1 part 11 notes that the new Canvey Town Centre Master Plan will identify ‘Opportunities for managing flood risk through greening, water capture schemes and the appropriate use of materials.’ This could be further amended.	enhance the public realm, health, wellbeing, biodiversity and air quality

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0282-0006	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	C1	Not Stated		No	Effective	ECC welcome the encouragement of opportunities for greening the town centre in criteria 10. However, the reasoned justification should be strengthened by demonstrating how this will be achieved. The greening of town centres can enhance public spaces, improve biodiversity, and support climate resilience through greening streets, creating attractive and welcoming town squares, and integrating multifunctional green infrastructure into new developments. The reasoned justification could refer to the Nature Towns and Cities accreditation launched in 2025 (https://naturetownsandcities.org.uk/). By 2035, the goal is for 5 million more people to have easy access to nature and green spaces, and for 1 million more children to grow and play in greener environments. https://naturetownsandcities.org.uk/ .3. Effective ECC welcome the encouragement of opportunities for greening the town centre in criteria 11. However, the reasoned justification should be strengthened by demonstrating how this will be achieved. The greening of town centres can enhance public spaces, improve	The reasoned justification could make reference to the Nature Towns and Cities accreditation launched in 2025 (https://naturetownsandcities.org.uk/) ECC require an amendment to paragraph 8.20 to read: `....The Paddocks site will be re-imagined as a lively community hub as part of a high quality mixed use development better connected to the town centre, which could support skills development of the local community . ECC require paragraph 8.22 is amended to read: There is scope within this area to increase tourism activities, including access to Thorney Bay Pavillion, through some additional business growth in the leisure and food and drink offer, and through the utilisation of public spaces including the park, the bandstand, and the beach.	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Supports policy suggests adding a reference to Nature Towns and Cities within the justification Supports policy to provide access to high quality safe and convenient walking and cycling routes within Canvey Town Centre Supports reference to The Paddock as a community and cultural asset on Canvey Island. There are opportunities for it to support skills development in the community	Accepted and reference added Add sentence to 8.13. There will be a need for local access to open spaces as well as space for visitors. There is also an opportunity to provide landscaping, green space and nature improvements for the benefit of residents and wildlife useful guidance can be found in Home - Nature Towns & Cities. Where there are opportunities to provide flexible... Officer additional text added to 8.17 Redevelopment of Canvey Town Centre also provides opportunities for landscaping and	14. Development proposals must satisfy the requirements of the habitats regulations and must be designed to protect and enhance ~~enable~~ ~~and~~ ~~support~~ the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). (Para 8.17)

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											biodiversity, and support climate resilience through greening streets, creating attractive and welcoming town squares, and integrating multifunctional green infrastructure into new developments. The reasoned justification could refer to the Nature Towns and Cities accreditation launched in 2025 (https://naturetownsandcities.org.uk/). By 2035, the goal is for 5 million more people to have easy access to nature and green spaces, and for 1 million more children to grow and play in greener environments. https://naturetownsandcities.org.uk/ ECC support reference to The Paddock as a community and cultural asset of Canvey Island. Reference could also be made to any opportunities for it to support skills development of the local community, where 43% of working age residents are low skilled compared to 31% for Essex (ONS 2021)								biodiversity improvements to this area to create attractive green spaces and planting for residents to enjoy No Mods Amend final sentence to 8.20 read: The Paddocks site will be re-imagined as a lively community hub as part of a high quality mixed use development better connected to the town centre, which could support skills development of the local community .munity	There will be a need for local access to open spaces as well as space for visitors. There is also an opportunity to provide landscaping, green space and nature improvements for the benefit of residents and wildlife useful guidance can be found in Home - Nature Towns & Cities. Where there are opportunities to provide flexible ...

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			(Para 8.20) ... to the town centre from the north and east. Redevelopment of Canvey Town Centre also provides opportunities for landscaping and biodiversity improvements to this area to create attractive green spaces and planting for residents to enjoy. : The Paddock site will be re-imagine d as a lively

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			commu nity hub as part of a high quality mixed use develop ment better connect ed to the town centre, which could support skills develop ment of the local commu nity. (Para 8.22) There is scope within this area to increase tourism activities , includin g access to Thorney Bay Pavillion , through some addition al

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			business growth in the leisure and food and drink offer, and through the utilisation of public spaces including the park, the bandstand, and the beach.
0 2 8 2 - 0 0 0 7	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	C1	Not Sta ted		Ye s		ECC welcome reference to future business growth and increases in tourism activities. Reference to Thorney Bay Pavillion as an asset in terms increasing tourism and attracting future business growth.		Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie d 8 addi tional app endi ces con taini ng vari ous piec es of evid enc e	B	Supports policy to provide access to high quality safe and convenient walking and cycling routes within Canvey Town Centre Supports reference to The Paddock as a community and cultural asset on Canvey Island. There are opportunities for it to support skills development in the community Supports policy suggests to add reference to Thorney Bay as an asset for increasing	Noted Accepted CPBC agrees that the Paddocks can provide opportunities to support skills development in the community Accepted CPBC agrees that Thorney Bay Pavillion can be an asset for increasing tourism and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	tourism and business growth.	business growth.	
0282008	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	C1			Yes		Reference to providing access to high quality safe and convenient, walking and cycling networks to ensure access is provided for town centre residents to access the lake, coastal areas, and larger open spaces is supported. Reference to active travel routes and shuttle buses to employment sites both on Canvey Island and in neighbouring economic centres, as well as to travel links (Benfleet train station) would be supported if feasible, which would increase access to employment sites and off-Island learning provision.		Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Supports policy. Suggests adding a reference to https://naturetownsandcities.org.uk/ as this would further strengthen this policy by demonstrating how this could be achieved.	Accepted and put reference to https://naturetownsandcities.org.uk/ in the justification at paragraph 8.13	
0336004	Organisation	Caroline	Peters	Essex Police		C1	Not Stated	The DOCO acknowledges the proposed regeneration and investment into Canvey Island Town Centre. Traditional town centres are known to have a higher rate of crime and ASB due to the mixed uses (inclusive of Nighttime Economy) and volume of people. It is strongly advised that the DOCO is involved in future meetings to discuss the regeneration of the Town Centre; this will help with the reduction of crime and ASB	Not Stated							A	Mixed use buildings can be difficult to secure if safety and security are not recognised in the early designed stages. At the appropriate stage it is advised there is liaison with the DOCO to ensure safety of residents is considered and CPTED principles have been applied.	Policy D1 requires opportunities for design out crime to be taken.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								and having a positive effect on the community. Additionally, the DOCO can aid with the future refurbishments and enhancements proposed within the regeneration of the Knightswick Centre.											
0 3 4 1 - 0 0 0 6	Organisati on	Jan et	Nutt al	Nat ural Eng alnd		C1	Yes	We are pleased to see reference to Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) in this and other place-based policies.	Ye s							A	We are pleased to see reference to Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) in this and other place-based policies.	Modification to Policy C1(14) Policy C1(14). Development proposals must satisfy the requirements of the habitats regulations and must be designed to enable and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).	Yes. Modifica tion to Policy C1(14) Policy C1(14). Develop ment proposal s must satisfy the require ments of the habitats regulati ons and must be designed to enable and support the habitat priority measure s identifie d within the Strategic Opportu nities set out in

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			the Essex Local Nature Recover y Strategy (LNRS).
1 4 3 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sha ron	Onei ll		Yes	C1	No		No	Effective			No				The Castle Point Plan in relation to policy C1 is not legall compliant	Comments noted.	N
0 9 5 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Phil ip	How e	The Peo ple's Inde pen dent Part y	Yes	C1	Yes		Ye s		The Plan is effective because Policy C1 (Canvey Town Centre Master Plan) provides a comprehensive, phased strategy for regeneration. This master- planning approach, which includes a clear 'Investment Proposition' and 'Delivery Plan,' demonstrates a proactive, market-facing approach that is already proving successful by attracting the £20 million Long-Term Plan for Towns funding. This makes the Plan highly deliverable.		No t An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed	Yes		Supports the Castle Point Plan and Policy C1	Support noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0725-0003	Individual	Janet	Dunford		Yes	C10	No	The area would create a danger to road users and is very near to the sea wall, given risk to flooding. Over development of the area, lack of parking as the roads are all restricted parking.	No	Consistent with national policy	Investigate the North Thundersley site and added to the plan.		Not Answered	Not Answered	Not Answered	C	Third Road needed onto Canvey Transport	Third Road onto Canvey The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. Access improvements for Canvey are a strategic matter which cannot be addressed through the Castle Point Plan alone, as any growth is only a proportion of the demand for those access improvements . The bulk of the demand come from the existing 16,000 households on Canvey. However, the strategic need for access improvements to Canvey Island have been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		identified through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex specifically identifies three projects which will improve accessibility to and from the Island. The Local Transport Plan sits alongside the Castle Point Plan, and the development in the Castle Point Plan will make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. Transport The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, assessing impacts and	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		recommending local interventions. These are identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Alongside this, the Local Transport Authority, Essex County Council, have prepared the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex includes wider local improvements to transport networks in and around Castle Point, including improved linkages to other areas. Growth in Castle Point will facilitate the delivery of the proposals in the Local Transport Plan 4.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0823-0005	Organisation	Pat	Abbott	Environment Agency	Yes	C2	Yes		Yes		Paragraph 8.25 - Refers to the work being undertaken to the flood defences to enhance this area and offer ongoing flood protection. We support the inclusion of this section, however this work is now complete and therefore the text is out of date.We feel it could be replaced with the following “The seafront sits behind the Canvey Island sea defences which have recently benefitted from the Environment Agency’s multi-million pound investment of central government funding to maintain the defences’ high level of tidal flood risk management work and deal with the impact of rising sea levels”	Paragraph 8.25 - Refers to the work being undertaken to the flood defences to enhance this area and offer ongoing flood protection. We support the inclusion of this section, however this work is now complete and therefore the text is out of date.We feel it could be replaced with the following “The seafront sits behind the Canvey Island sea defences which have recently benefitted from the Environment Agency’s multi-million pound investment of central government funding to maintain the defences’ high level of tidal flood risk management work and deal with the impact of rising sea levels”	No	Not Answered		A	Supports the policy but makes suggestion to correct that the works to the sea defences have now been completed “Theseafront sits behind the Canvey Island sea defences which have recently benefitted from the Environment Agency’s multi-million pound investment of central government funding to maintain the defences’ high level of tidal flood risk management work and deal with the impact of rising sea levels”	See modifications proposed	8.25 The seafront sits behind the Canvey Island sea defences which ~~are~~ ~~undergoing~~ ~~enhanced~~ ~~work to~~ ~~increase~~ ~~their~~ ~~protection~~ ~~and~~ ~~deal with~~ ~~the~~ ~~impact~~ ~~of rising~~ ~~sea~~ ~~levels-~~ ~~have~~ ~~recently~~ ~~benefitted~~ ~~ed~~ ~~from~~ ~~the~~ ~~Environment~~ ~~Agency’s~~ ~~multi-million~~ ~~pound~~ ~~investm~~ ~~ent~~ ~~of~~ ~~central~~ ~~governm~~ ~~ent~~ ~~funding~~ ~~to~~ ~~maintai~~ ~~n the~~

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			defence s' high level of tidal flood risk manage ment work and deal with the impact of rising sea levels.
0 3 3 6 - 0 0 0 5	Organisati on	Car olin e	Pete rs	Esse x Poli ce		C2	Not Sta ted	It is referenced there will be a Master Plan prepared by the Council which 'will set out a clear vision and objectives for the area'. When preparing the master plan, we would advocate that in addition to the mitigation of crime and ASB, that developers incorporate measures to reduce the opportunities for 'Violence against Women and Young Girls' across their proposals. As part of the consultation process, engagement with the DOCO will ensure that the Sea Front area is safe and inclusive all at all times (this will consider the Nighttime Economy).	No t Sta ted							A	When preparing the master plan, we would advocate that in addition to the mitigation of crime and ASB, that developers incorporate measures to reduce the opportunities for 'Violence against Women and Young Girls' across their proposals. As part of the consultation process, engagement with the DOCO will ensure that the Sea Front area is safe and inclusive all at all times (this will consider the Nighttime Economy).	This site will be assessed under policy D1 which includes opportunities for design out crime to be taken	N
0 3 2 3 -	Organisati on	Mic hael	Atki ns	Port of Lon don		C2											<u>Policy C2 - Canvey Seafront Entertainment Area:</u> Support the Councils intention	Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0002				Authority													to prepare a Master Plan for the Canvey Seafront Entertainment area. The PLA has previously been consulted on initial discussions and would wish to continue to be involved in the project as it progresses.		
0219-0004	Individual	Gram	Bracci		Yes	C3	Yes	CPBC Plan Pages 38 – 39 2.01 Insufficient Controls on Activities: There is no clear framework for monitoring or regulating port operations. Policies SD6 (Pollution Control), SD1 (Flood Risk), and SD8 (Hazardous Uses) should be explicitly referenced and integrated into Policy C3 to ensure proper oversight. 2.02 The Port Facility at Canvey Island specifically only facilitates the unloading for storage, forwarding on and bunkering of huge quantities of hazardous materials, these being LPG, oil and fuel-based products, serving the Upper Tier Establishments (upper tier, being a recognition of specified quantities of certain dangerous substances processed or stored, having the potential to cause significant on-site and off-site consequence to	No	Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy	Summary Statement This representation is submitted in response to the Regulation 19 consultation on the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan 2026–2043. It is our view that the Plan fails all four tests of soundness as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Plan is underpinned by incomplete evidence, lacks consequence-based risk analysis, and proposes development in areas where public safety cannot be guaranteed—particularly on Canvey Island. 1. Is the Plan Positively Prepared ? The Plan is not positively prepared to meet the area’s objectively assessed development needs in a sustainable manner. It adopts a narrow urban-focused strategy that disproportionately		Yes	To introduce and explain any extra specific supporting evidence in relation to the matters raised in this submission during		C	Highlights risks at hazardous sites Hazardous installations and port-related activities are inadequately assessed, with no detailed COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards) consequence analysis provided. The plan increases population exposure in the vicinity of known COMAH sites hazard range consequence and flood-prone areas, without demonstrating that safer alternatives were adequately considered. It fails to identify Canvey Island as a single flood cell requiring open space catchment areas for flood mitigation. The	Hazardous installations and port-related activities As set out in Plan paragraph 8.28 ‘Both port facilities are registered as Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) sites due to the hazardous nature of the goods that they receive and store. The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and the Environment Agency are responsible for regulating activities at these sites,	Policy Hou5 – Park Homes. 1. New park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites as defined on the Policies Map, and subject to compliance with other plan policies Justification: The existing wording

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								employees, the wider members of the public, including the possibility of causing multiple fatalities) of Calor Gas and Oikos. 2.03 The Plan fails to reference or take into account the proposed Oikos Marine & South Side Development (Case Ref: TR030004), a live Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) currently in the pre-application phase. 9 Should this application be accepted the resulting outcome would effectively double the storage capacity provided by this establishment. This omission undermines the Local Plan’s compliance with the tests of soundness when set against Policy C4 increased societal risk. Calor Gas and Oikos Major Hazards Storage and Distribution Site 2.04 The Castle Point Plan Policy SD8 fails to address the significance of the hazardous sites of Calor Gas and Oikos by not employing the current HSE methodology, despite CPBC being the designated Hazardous Substances Authority. These sites pose significant risks due to the nature of materials handled and their proximity to the			exposes vulnerable communities, particularly on Canvey Island, to extreme risks. The prioritisation of Green Belt land over public safety concerns undermines the integrity of the planning process. The Plan selectively identifies flood risk constraints (Footnote 7) and then actively proposes development in those high-risk areas. The NPPF 2024 explicitly removes the ability for councils to set lower housing targets unless exceptional constraints are proven. While the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey. Conclusion: The Plan does not seek to meet development needs in a sustainable or safe manner. 2. Is the Plan Justified ? The Plan lacks proportionate evidence and fails to consider reasonable alternatives. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) omits site-specific modelling and consequencebased analysis for vulnerable populations. Hazardous installations and port-related activities			ng the Examination in Public (EiP) processes		Plan is not based on proportionate evidence and fails to justify its spatial strategy. Furthermore, the Plan does not reflect legal duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 or COMAH Regulations to plan for foreseeable emergencies. The Plan does not integrate consequence-based planning for flood risk or hazardous installations.	and also provide advice on the level of hazard the installations pose to nearby development. Both installations have HSE consultation zones identified around them, in which it is expected that other development is controlled to limit unnecessary harm to life and property. The extent of these zones is determined by the nature of the goods received and stored on site, and the technical measures employed to ensure safety at the sites. It is therefore possible that the level of hazard posed to other developments nearby can be reduced, both by limiting	may be misinterpreted that intensification of Park Homes is automatically acceptable in principle . Noting that park home sites exist within areas of serious constraint such as the consultation zone for hazardous installations (Policy SD8), FZ3, etc.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d				
								existing and proposed increase of residential areas. The absence of a clear direction undermines CPBC’s statutory responsibilities and leaves a critical gap in strategic planning, emergency preparedness, and community safety. 2.05 The description of these being Hazardous Sites somewhat discredits their potential to do harm. These are in fact Major Hazardous Sites categorised as “UPPER TIER ESTABLISHMENTS” described as follows. Establishments 2.06 The term “Establishment” generally relates to the whole location under the control of an operator whose activities involve installations handling specified dangerous substances, present in specified quantities. Installation 2.07 The term “Installation” generally means a technical unit within an “Establishment” whether at or below ground level, in which dangerous substances are produced, used, handled or stored and includes all equipment, structures, pipelines, machinery, tools, private railways sidings, docks, unloading quays			are inadequately assessed, with no detailed COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards) consequence analysis provided. The plan increases population exposure in the vicinity of known COMAH sites hazard range consequence and flood-prone areas, without demonstrating that safer alternatives were adequately considered. It fails to identify Canvey Island as a single flood cell requiring open space catchment areas for flood mitigation . Whilst the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey, despite failing to provide the required Level II SFRA Conclusion: The Plan is not based on proportionate evidence and fails to justify its spatial strategy. 3. Is the Plan Effective ? The Plan is not effective or deliverable given the known constraints. Major allocations such as West Canvey Island and the Seaview Road corridor lie within flood zones and lack infrastructure to support emergency planning.											development nearby, and also by seeking improvements to the level of hazard posed by these sites, both during normal management and maintenance, and also at the point where new development is proposed’ The current HSE consultation zones are indicated on the policies map. The plan doesn’t propose any new housing allocations in the HSE consultation zone. However, some existing residential areas are already within the zone, as well as the Thorney Bay Park Homes site. Policy SD8	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d				
								serving the installation, jetties, warehouse or similar structures, floating or otherwise necessary for the operation of that installation Domino Effect. 2.08 The proximity of the “Establishments of Oikos and Calor and their Installations,” could be the source of, or increase the risk or consequences, of a major accident and of domino effects. Off-Site Hazard Range Major Accident Consequence Analysis. 2.09 Many things can go wrong at major hazardous sites and despite the risk being maintained to, as low as reasonably practicable, residual risk remains. The serious consequences of unconfined vapour cloud explosions, flash fires, and BLEVEs are very well known. Undertaking “Off-Site Hazard Range Consequence Analysis” provides CPBC with a better understanding of impact distance consequence emanating from major accidents. 10 2.10 Given the above, it is imperative that CPBC’s Plan establishes meaningful Major Hazardous Site Local Policies that support objectives preventing major			Pressures on roads and healthcare are acknowledged but not resolved through binding delivery mechanisms. The primary housing site is not shovel-ready and faces significant delivery time constraints, undermining the Plan’s ability to meet urgent housing needs. Conclusion: The Plan is not deliverable without significant risk to public safety and infrastructure capacity. 4. Consistent with National Policy ? The Plan fails to meet the housing targets set by the Standard Methodology and does not integrate consequence-based planning for flood risk or hazardous installations. This is contrary to NPPF guidance and Planning Practise Guidance on safe development and resilience. Furthermore, the Plan does not reflect legal duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 or COMAH Regulations to plan for foreseeable emergencies. Conclusion: The Plan is inconsistent with national policy and statutory obligations for riskinformed development. In light of the above, we respectfully											‘Development near Hazardous Uses’ states that ‘Development proposals will be assessed in accordance with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Guidance where they fall within a consultation zone for one or more hazardous installations. Where the HSE advises against development the planning application will be refused on health and safety grounds’. Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The Councils detailed emergency	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
								accidents and limiting the off-site consequences of such accidents for human health, safety and the environment. Such policies, informed by the information provided by Upper Tier Establishments Safety Reports, specifically to assist with incumbent Off-Site Emergency and Land-Use-Planning.			request that the Castle Point Local Plan 2026–2043 be withdrawn or substantially revised to address the issues raised in this representation. The Plan must be re-evaluated to ensure it meets the tests of soundness, prioritises public safety, and complies with national policy and legal obligation. Is the Plan Legal ? On the basis that this plan has been constructed by professional planners, we could not consider ourselves qualified to challenge its legality, subsequently we are compelled to respond "YES" to this question. However, this submission sets out to indicate that CPBC draft Reg19 consultation may well prove to be unsound or even illegal, being neither positively prepared nor adequately evidenced. The advice provided at 1.09 and 1.10 of this submission, has not been made lightly and goes some way to support our argument that adopting a wholly no Green Belt development policy, at the expense of public safety is somewhat perverse. Prioritising mainland Green Belt protection without fully accounting for major								planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											incident hazard range and the potential for catastrophic flood events on Canvey Island, effectively subdividing the borough's communities, may make the draft CPBC Plan be deemed not only unreasonable but also unprincipled and corporately illogical.								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0220-0004	Individual	Steve	Sawkins		Yes	C3		CPBC Plan Pages 38 – 392.01 Insufficient Controls on Activities: There is no clear framework for monitoring or regulating port operations. Policies SD6 (Pollution Control), SD1 (Flood Risk), and SD8(Hazardous Uses) should be explicitly referenced and integrated into Policy C3 to ensure proper oversight.2.02 The Port Facility at Canvey Island specifically only facilitates the unloading for storage,forwarding on and bunkering of huge quantities of hazardous materials, these being LPG, oiland fuel-based products, serving the Upper Tier Establishments (upper tier, being arecognition of specified quantities of certain dangerous substances processed or stored,having the potential to cause significant on-site and off-site consequence to employees, thewider members of the public, including the possibility of causing multiple fatalities) of CalorGas and Oikos.2.03 The Plan fails to reference or take into account the proposed Oikos Marine & SouthSide Development (Case Ref: TR030004), a live Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project(NSIP) currently in the pre-application phase. 9Should this application be accepted	No	Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy	Summary StatementThis representation is submitted in response to the Regulation 19 consultation on the CastlePoint Borough Council Local Plan 2026–2043. It is our view that the Plan fails all four testsof soundness as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Plan isunderpinned by incomplete evidence, lacks consequence-based risk analysis, and proposesdevelopment in areas where public safety cannot be guaranteed—particularly on CanveyIsland.1. Is the Plan Positively Prepared ?The Plan is not positively prepared to meet the area’s objectively assessed development needsin a sustainable manner. It adopts a narrow urban-focused strategy that disproportionatelyexposes vulnerable communities, particularly on Canvey Island, to extreme risks. Theprioritisation of Green Belt land over public safety concerns undermines the integrity of theplanning process.The Plan selectively identifies flood risk constraints (Footnote 7) and then actively proposesdevelopment in those high-risk areas. The NPPF 2024 explicitly removes the ability forcouncils to set lower		Yes	To introduce and explain any extra specific supporting evidence in relation to the matters raised in this submission during the Examination in Public (EiP) process		C	Highlights risks at hazardous sitesHazardous installations and port-related activities are inadequately assessed, with no detailed COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards) consequence analysis provided. The plan increases population exposure in the vicinity of known COMAH sites hazard range consequence and flood-prone areas, without demonstrating that safer alternatives were adequately considered. It fails to identify Canvey Island as a single flood cell requiring open space catchment areas for flood mitigation. The Plan is not based on proportionate evidence and fails to justify its spatial strategy. Furthermore, the Plan does not reflect legal duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 or COMAH Regulations to plan for foreseeable	Hazardous installations and port-related activitiesAs set out in Plan paragraph 8.28 ‘Both port facilities are registered as Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) sites due to the hazardous nature of the goods that they receive and store. The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and the Environment Agency are responsible for regulating activities at these sites, and also provide advice on the level of hazard the installations pose to nearby development. Both installations have HSE consultation zones identified around them,	Policy Hou5 – Park Homes. 1. New park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites as defined on the Policies Map, and subject to compliance with other plan policies Justification: The existing wording may be misinterpreted that intensification of Park Homes is automatically acceptable in principle

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								the resulting outcome would effectively double thestorage capacity provided by this establishment. This omission undermines the Local Plan’scompliance with the tests of soundness when set against Policy C4 increased societal risk.Calor Gas and Oikos Major Hazards Storage and Distribution Site2.04 The Castle Point Plan Policy SD8 fails to address the significance of the hazardous sitesof Calor Gas and Oikos by not employing the current HSE methodology, despite CPBC beingthe designated Hazardous Substances Authority. These sites pose significant risks due to thenature of materials handled and their proximity to the existing and proposed increase ofresidential areas. The absence of a clear direction undermines CPBC’s statutoryresponsibilities and leaves a critical gap in strategic planning, emergency preparedness, andcommunity safety.2.05 The description of these being Hazardous Sites somewhat discredits their potential to doharm. These are in fact Major Hazardous Sites categorised as “UPPER TIERESTABLISHMENTS” described as follows.Establishments2.06			housing targets unless exceptional constraints are proven. While thePlan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significanthousing development to West Canvey.Conclusion: The Plan does not seek to meet development needs in a sustainable or safemanner.2. Is the Plan Justified ?The Plan lacks proportionate evidence and fails to consider reasonable alternatives. TheStrategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) omits site-specific modelling and consequencebasedanalysis for vulnerable populations. Hazardous installations and port-related activitiesare inadequately assessed, with no detailed COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards)consequence analysis provided.The plan increases population exposure in the vicinity of known COMAH sites hazard rangeconsequence and flood-prone areas, without demonstrating that safer alternatives wereadequately considered. It fails to identify Canvey Island as a single flood cell requiring openspace catchment areas for flood mitigation.Whilst the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocatessignificant housing					emergencies.The Plan does not integrate consequence-based planning for flood risk or hazardous installations.	in which it is expected that other development is controlled to limit unnecessary harm to life and property. The extent of these zones is determined by the nature of the goods received and stored on site, and the technical measures employed to ensure safety at the sites. It is therefore possible that the level of hazard posed to other developments nearby can be reduced, both by limiting development nearby, and also by seeking improvements to the level of hazard posed by these sites, both during normal management and maintenance, and also at the	. Noting that park home sites exist within areas of serious constrai nt such as the consulta tion zone for hazardo us installati ons (Policy SD8), FZ3, etc.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d					
								The term “Establishment” generally relates to the whole location under the control of anoperator whose activities involve installations handling specified dangerous substances,present in specified quantities.Installation2.07 The term “Installation” generally means a technical unit within an “Establishment”whether at or below ground level, in which dangerous substances are produced, used, handledor stored and includes all equipment, structures, pipelines, machinery, tools, private railways sidings, docks, unloading quays serving the installation, jetties, warehouse or similarstructures, floating or otherwise necessary for the operation of that installationDomino Effect.2.08 The proximity of the “Establishments of Oikos and Calor and their Installations,” couldbe the source of, or increase the risk or consequences, of a major accident and of dominoeffects.Off-Site Hazard Range Major Accident Consequence Analysis.2.09 Many things can go wrong at major hazardous sites and despite the risk beingmaintained to, as low as reasonably practicable, residual risk			development to West Canvey, despite failing to provide the requiredLevel II SFRAConclusion: The Plan is not based on proportionate evidence and fails to justify its spatialstrategy.3. Is the Plan Effective ?The Plan is not effective or deliverable given the known constraints. Major allocations suchas West Canvey Island and the Seaview Road corridor lie within flood zones and lackinfrastructure to support emergency planning. Pressures on roads and healthcare areacknowledged but not resolved through binding delivery mechanisms.The primary housing site is not shovel-ready and faces significant delivery time constraints,undermining the Plan’s ability to meet urgent housing needs.Conclusion: The Plan is not deliverable without significant risk to public safety andinfrastructure capacity.4. Consistent with National Policy ?The Plan fails to meet the housing targets set by the Standard Methodology and does notintegrate consequence-based planning for flood risk or hazardous installations. This iscontrary to NPPF guidance and Planning Practise Guidance on safe development andresilience.Furthermore, the Plan does not reflect												point where new development is proposed’The current HSE consultation zones are indicated on the policies map. The plan doesn’t propose any new housing allocations in the HSE consultation zone. However, some existing residential areas are already within the zone, as well as the Thorney Bay Park Homes site.Policy SD8 ‘Development near Hazardous Uses’ states that ‘Development proposals will be assessed in accordance with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Guidance where they fall	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
								remains. The seriousconsequences of unconfined vapour cloud explosions, flash fires, and BLEVEs are very wellknown. Undertaking “Off- Site Hazard Range Consequence Analysis” provides CPBC with abetter understanding of impact distance consequence emanating from major accidents. 102.10 Given the above, it is imperative that CPBC’s Plan establishes meaningful MajorHazardous Site Local Policies that support objectives preventing major accidents and limitingthe off-site consequences of such accidents for human health, safety and the environment.Such policies, informed by the information provided by Upper Tier Establishments SafetyReports, specifically to assist with incumbent Off-Site Emergency and Land-Use-Planning.			legal duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 orCOMAH Regulations to plan for foreseeable emergencies.Conclusion: The Plan is inconsistent with national policy and statutory obligations for riskinformeddevelopment. In light of the above, we respectfully request that the Castle PointLocal Plan 2026–2043 be withdrawn or substantially revised to address the issues raised inthis representation. The Plan must be re-evaluated to ensure it meets the tests of soundness,prioritises public safety, and complies with national policy and legal obligation.Is the Plan Legal ?On the basis that this plan has been constructed by professional planners, we could notconsider ourselves qualified to challenge its legality, subsequently we are compelled torespond "YES" to this question.However, this submission sets out to indicate that CPBC draft Reg19 consultation may wellprove to be unsound or even illegal, being neither positively prepared nor adequatelyevidenced.The advice provided at 1.09 and 1.10 of this submission, has not been made lightly and goessome way to support our argument that adopting a wholly no Green Belt development policy,at the expense of public safety is								within a consultation zone for one or more hazardous installations. Where the HSE advises against development the planning application will be refused on health and safety grounds’.Need s of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											somewhat perverse.Prioritising mainland Green Belt protection without fully accounting for major incidenthazard range and the potential for catastrophic flood events on Canvey Island, effectivelysubdividing the borough's communities, may make the draft CPBC Plan be deemed not onlyunreasonable but also unprincipled and corporately illogical.								
0 3 6 0 - 0 0 0 1	Organisati on	Mar len e	Curt is	Briti sh Hors e Soci ety		C3					First the BHS acknowledges that Policy C3 - Canvey Port Facilities (d) includes equestrians when public access is sought and enhanced along the coastal path and where Item 8.30 pg. 39 repeats the opportunities.				See atta ch me nt	B	Support for Policy C3 criteria d and paragraph 8.30.	Support noted.	N
0 2 8 2 -	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty	Yes	C3	Yes		No	Effective	ECC support Criteria e requiring any substantive redevelopment, a change of use or change of materials handled being made in		Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie	B	Supports policy that redevelopment and change of use or materials should be made in accordance	Noted:	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0009				Council							accordance with the requirements of Policy ENV3 and SD1				d 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence		with policies ENV3 and SD1		
0336-0006	Organisation	Caroline	Peters	Essex Police		C3	Not Stated	It is noted that future development within the Port will be addressed under Permitted Development. The DOCO acknowledges the parameters of such applications but would welcome consultation in relation to the design and layout, cognisant of sustainability requirements for the public access route and proposed local cycling and walking routes.	Not Stated							A	It is noted that future development within the Port will be addressed under Permitted Development. The DOCO acknowledges the parameters of such applications but would welcome consultation in relation to the design and layout, cognisant of sustainability requirements for the public access route and proposed local cycling and walking routes.	Within the parameters of the applications submitted where possible Essex police will be consulted.	N
0341-0	Organisation	Janet	Nuttall	Natural England		C3	Yes	Natural England notes the potential for development or redevelopment of the facilities at this site and are pleased that Castle Point recognise the importance of	Yes							A	Natural England notes the potential for development or redevelopment of the facilities at this site and are pleased	Support noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 7								ensuring any proposals of this nature must be in line with relevant nature conservation legislation to avoid impacting any nearby protected sites.									that Castle Point recognise the importance of ensuring any proposals of this nature must be in line with relevant nature conservation legislation to avoid impacting any nearby protected sites.		
1 0 1 2 - 0 0 0 1	Agent	Arun	Sriskanda	Oikos Storage Ltd c/o Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd	Yes	C3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	1. Oikos Storage Limited (Oikos) welcomes and supports the inclusion of a section in the presubmission Plan, which deals specifically with its site as a port facility and acknowledges its national significance. Oikos also welcomes the fact that, following the examination and subsequent receipt of the Inspector's Report into the 2022 version of the Local Plan, a significant number of alterations have been made to the policy and its supporting text. Unfortunately, however, Oikos considers that, as currently drafted, certain aspects of this section of the plan are still unsound, as explained below. Policy C3 2. The draft policy usefully outlines a series of criteria that future development proposals at the site will be assessed against. In general, this is a helpful approach, which should provide a level	Policy C3 needs to be redrafted to read something along the lines of the following: Within the allocated Port Related Facilities Area shown on the Policies Map, applications for development will be permitted, subject to the following criteria: a. The design of the proposed development must not cause significant harm to the landscape or environmental assets, having regard to the scale of existing development on the site; c. There must be no unacceptable change in the level of hazard or risk posed by the facility as a consequence of the proposals. The Health and Safety Executive must be consulted and their satisfaction sought in relation to this matter; d. Public access to the coastal path adjacent to the site must be protected, and opportunities to enhance access will be explored where	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Oikos Storage Limited (Oikos) welcomes and supports the inclusion of a section in the presubmission Plan, which deals specifically with its site as a port facility and acknowledges its national significance. Oikos also welcomes the fact that, following the examination and subsequent receipt of the Inspector's Report into the 2022 version of the Local Plan, a significant number of alterations have been made to the policy and its supporting text. Unfortunately, however, Oikos considers that, as currently drafted, certain aspects of this section of the plan are still	Policy C3: It is considered the policy is sufficiently supportive of Canvey Port Facilities. The word 'normally' acknowledges that there are standard planning considerations and criteria that need to be adhered to. The planning authority is obliged to consider the views of statutory consultees and other material considerations in the development management decision making process.	C3(d): Public access to the coastal path adjacent to the site must be protected and opportunities to enhance access for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians will be sought where appropriate;

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d			
											of certainty for Oikos in any proposals that it brings forward. Oikos considers, however, that the caveat within the introductory sentence of the policy - ‘will normally be permitted’ (emphasis added) - introduces ambiguity into the decision-making process and removes the certainty that the policy should be aiming to achieve. 3. The NPPF makes clear (paragraph (16(d)) that, amongst other things, Local Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. As a result of the wording highlighted, it is Oikos’ view that the draft policy is not positively prepared, and the effectiveness of its implementation is reduced. The wording should be amended to remove this uncertainty. A suggested alteration has been highlighted below. Policy C3 – Criterion b. 4. Criterion b. of the draft policy requires certain proposals to demonstrate that they are in the national interest. It is Oikos view that this criterion is unjustified and inconsistent with national policy. The NPPF indicates that such a policy	they are appropriate and do not compromise the safety and security of the facilities or their operations						unsound, as explained below. Objects to Policy C3 intro paragraph wording caveat within the introductory sentence of the policy - ‘will normally be permitted’ (emphasis added) , saying this introduces ambiguity into the decision-making process and removes the certainty that the policy should be aiming to achieve. Objects to Policy C3(b) requirement for the policy to be in the national interests, suggests this is contray to the NPPF and The National Policy Statement for Ports (NPSfP) Objects to Policy C3(d) sating enhancements to access 'will' be sought. Taking a blanket approach to proposals in such a sensitive location is not considered to be justified or effective. Paragraph			C3(b). Paragraph 8.27 notes that <i>'The Calor Gas and Oikos terminals are nationally significant and have a role to play in ensuring the security of energy supplies in the UK'</i> . Their national interest role is thererfore implicit C3(d) Agreed that the coastal path may not be relevant or proximate to every application, see modification to Policy C3(d) proposed to align with supporting text, C3(e): Given the environmental sensitivities, specific cross-reference is considerd	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											consideration is only necessary in respect of major development in certain designated areas, for example, National Parks (NPPF paragraph 190). The Oikos facility is not located within such an area, but this criterion would require it to be demonstrated that the relevant proposals at the site were in the national interest, a potentially onerous requirement for which no justification has been provided. 5. The National Policy Statement for Ports (NPSfP) – a national policy statement to which the emerging plan has to have regard to in terms of port facilities and port development matters - similarly does not require it to be demonstrated that port development is in the national interest in order for it to be approved. Again, only proposals in certain designated areas, or affecting certain designated areas in a particular way, are required to meet a such onerous policy test along these lines – circumstances which do not apply to the Oikos facility. In fact, the NPSfP makes it clear in the section providing guidance to the decision maker on the need for additional port capacity (section 3.5) that the need for future capacity should be accepted and that						8.30 of the reasoned justification appears to acknowledge the need for flexibility in this location and seeks to ‘explore’ such opportunities rather than imposing a definitive position. Unfortunately, however, this understanding has not been reflected in the draft policy. Policy C3 (e) The purpose of including this criterion is unclear and appears unnecessary. The starting point for the assessment of development proposals is the consideration of compliance against all policies within the Local Plan. The need to explicitly require compliance with two specific policies is, therefore, not apparent and results in a duplication that is unjustified.	appropriate in this case.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											consequently there should be a presumption in favour of granting consent for port development infrastructure. Having regard to the Government’s proposed revisions to the NPSfP (published in June 2025) the national policy position on the need for port development is, in Oikos’ view, likely to further be strengthened. 6. The NPPF highlights that planning should encourage sustainable economic growth and create the conditions to build a strong, competitive economy in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight is to be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development (paragraph 85). The imposition of onerous policy restrictions is particularly significant in respect of port facilities, which, as the NPSfP makes clear, operate in a market-led industry where competition between ports is encouraged (paragraphs 3.3.1 and 3.4.13). 7. The unsound nature of this criteria is further illustrated by the fact that a situation could arise where an									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											application for an alteration to the facility includes a change of material handled that does not result in an unacceptable change in the level of hazard or risk and is acceptable to the Health and Safety Executive (and thereby meets other relevant criteria of the policy) but is able to be refused because it cannot be demonstrated to be in the national interest. 8. Finally, leaving aside the above, this suggested policy criterion is not effective. Having correctly recognised that the facilities being referred to are of national significance, it would seemingly be possible to argue that any development proposal put forward in connection with them would be in the national interest. For the reasons summarised above, criterion b. of draft policy C3 needs to be deleted. Policy C3 – Criterion d. 9. Oikos understands the importance of protecting public access along the coastal path that runs along the southern boundary of the facility. Criterion d. of the draft policy, however, extends further than protection and requires that opportunities to enhance access ‘will be’ sought. 10. As noted within the								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											reasoned justification text both the Oikos and Calor facilities are registered as Control of Major Accident Hazard (COMAH) sites due to the nature of the goods received and stored at the sites. Taking a blanket approach to proposals in such a sensitive location is not considered to be justified or effective. Paragraph 8.30 of the reasoned justification appears to acknowledge the need for flexibility in this location and seeks to ‘explore’ such opportunities rather than imposing a definitive position. Unfortunately, however, this understanding has not been reflected in the draft policy text. 11. Maintaining safety and security at the Oikos facility is paramount, and it is within this context that enhanced access must be considered. Proposed amendments to the policy wording regarding these matters are outlined below. Policy C3 – Criterion e. 12. The purpose of including this criterion is unclear and appears unnecessary. The starting point for the assessment of development proposals is the consideration of compliance against all policies within the Local Plan. The need to									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											explicitly require compliance with two specific policies is, therefore, not apparent and results in a duplication that is unjustified. 13. Furthermore, stipulating instances where consideration is ‘especially’ relevant suggests that in other instances it is less so. Thus, reducing the clarity of the criterion and the policy’s effectiveness. Such a flexible approach to compliance is not replicated within Policies ENV3 and SD4, and as such, results in internal inconsistencies within the Local Plan. It is suggested that this criterion should be removed.									
1012-0002	Agent	Arun	Sriskanda	Oikos Storage Ltd c/o Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd	Yes	C3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Paragraph 8.27 – Oikos would highlight that this paragraph only provides a partial description of the type of products which its facilities handle. Increasingly, as the nation transitions to net zero, the Oikos facility handles various sustainable fuel products.	Oikos also suggests that additional clarification is made to the supporting text at paragraph 8.27 as indicated in its comments above.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Paragraph 8.27 only provides a partial description of the type of products handled at this facility	It is aimed to provide a brief explanation and considered acceptable, however please see modification added to include "various sustainable fuel products".	8.27 There are two port facilities located adjacent to each other at south Canvey. These port facilities	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			include the Calor Gas terminal located to the west of Thames Road for the importation and storage of liquefied petroleum gas and the Oikos terminal to the east of Haven Road, which receives and stores oil and a range of hydrocarbon products and various sustainable fuel products. Both terminal s...
101	Agent	Arun	Sriskanda	Oikos Stor	Yes	C3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective,	Paragraph 8.30 - Oikos acknowledges the need to take account of the		Yes	Not Ans	Yes	A	Objecting to the 19m buffer referred to at paragraph 8.30	This is addressed in more detail at	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
2-0003				age Ltd c/o Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd						Justified, Consistent with national policy	requirement to improve flood defences adjacent to its site in the future, but the proposed way in which the presubmission Plan is seeking to do this is unsound. Regard should be had to Oikos' separate representation on policy SD1 in respect of the safeguarded area referred to in paragraph 8.30.			wered				the comments for SD1 at entry 1012-0005	
0323-0003	Organisation	Michael	Atkins	Port of London Authority		C3											<u>Policy C3 - Canvey Port Facilities:</u> In principle the PLA support the continued promotion of the boroughs port facilities at Canvey and it is welcomed that supporting paragraph 8.27 states recognises that The Calor Gas and Oikos terminals are nationally significant and have a role to play in ensuring the security of energy supplies in the UK. In addition it is considered that there should be a link added to policy SD6 (Pollution Control) particularly with regard to the importance for SD6(3) that development proposals adjacent	Mods proposed	8.27 There are two port facilities located adjacent to each other at south Canvey. These port facilities include the Calor Gas terminal located to the west of Thames Road for the importation and storage of liquefied petroleum gas and the

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	to, or in the vicinity of, existing businesses or community facilities will need to demonstrate that the ongoing use of the existing businesses or community facilities would not be prejudiced by the proposed development, in line with the Agent of Change included in paragraph 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2025). Note and support the reference (Paragraph 8.32) to the Southeast Inshore Marine Plan and the potential need for separate consents from the Marine Management Organisation (MMO). Alongside this there should be a reference to the Port of London Authority's River Works Licencing process, which also forms a requirement as part of any works in, on or over the Tidal Thames. Within paragraph 8.30 – the reference		Oikos terminal to the east of Haven Road, which receives and stores oil and a range of hydrocarbon products . Both terminals have close good deep-water accessible jetties with good access to shipping lanes that are used to receive fuel imports by ship. These fuels are exported from the terminals by pipeline s and by

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	to the English Coast Path should be updated to state 'King Charles III England Coast Path'.		road tanker. The Calor Gas and Oikos terminals are nationally significant, well situated close to the mouth of the Thames estuary and gateway to the Port of London , and have a role to play in ensuring the security of energy supplies in the UK. 8.30 The port facilities occupy a substantial frontage of the waterfront at

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			South Canvey. This limits access to a narrow strip of the waterfront in this location, creating an enclosing effect for users. This route, which is part of the ~~English Coast~~ King Charles III England Path, is not bicycle or equestrian friendly 8.32 It should be noted that as these facilities are adjacent

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			to the coast, the South East Inshore Marine Plan is also relevant in respect of any development which affects the seaward side of the defence s. Consideration needs to be given to how any such changes impact on the marine environment or its use, including any conflicts arising with other users. Separate consent

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			s from the Marine Management Organisation will be required for certain types of activity, and the Port of London Authority's River Works Licencing process also forms a requirement as part of any works in, on or over the Tidal Thames.
1 4 4 0 - 0 0 1 1 1	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	C3	Yes		No	Justified	Currently this Policy does not factor in features that will support increased biodiversity, in particular scarce and rare invertebrates, nor the risk of any recreational disturbance in the case of redevelopment of the port (Paragraph 8.31).	Any redevelopment of the port should factor in features that will support increased biodiversity in particular scarce and rare invertebrates, to align with Essex LNRS aims and the Thames Estuary North Important Invertebrate Area. This can be done by taking the opportunity to include brownfield habitat within the	No				Currently this Policy does not factor in features that will support increased biodiversity, in particular scarce and rare invertebrates, nor the risk of any recreational disturbance in the case of	Part a of the existing policy states 'The design of the proposed development must not cause significant harm to the landscape or environmental	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												development; green roofs, sandy planted areas/sandbanks, use of waste material such as crushed concrete in gabion baskets are examples of this, and buffer zones of low-nutrient substrates and scrub. The potential mitigation for any recreational disturbance should feature in Section 8.31 in the case of redevelopment of the port.					redevelopment of the port (Paragraph 8.31). Any redevelopment of the port should factor in features that will support increased biodiversity in particular scarce and rare invertebrates, to align with Essex LNRS aims and the Thames Estuary North Important Invertebrate Area. This can be done by taking the opportunity to include brownfield habitat within the development; green roofs, sandy planted areas/sandbanks, use of waste material such as crushed concrete in gabion baskets are examples of this, and buffer zones of low-nutrient substrates and scrub. The potential mitigation for any recreational disturbance should feature in Section 8.31 in the case of redevelopment of the port.	assets, having regard to the scale of existing development on the site;' Part e notes the imporatance of compliance with ENV3 which covers recreational disturtbance to international sites and biodiversity net gain (although all policies in the Plan should be read as a whole).	
1441	Agent	Rupert	Wood	Thames Enterprise	Yes	C3	Yes		No	Not Stated			No				Policy C3 is legally compliant but not sound	Comment noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 3				e Park Ltd															
0 0 2 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Lili- Mar ie	Ben mor e		Yes	C4	No	Policy C4 – West Canvey 1. Legal Compliance I do not consider the Castle Point Plan to be legally compliant for the following reasons: * Accessibility of Consultation: The consultation has not been accessible to all residents. Many people in Canvey Island do not have reliable internet access, cannot easily travel to the library, or struggle to navigate the lengthy and complex online documents. This has effectively excluded a large portion of the community from meaningful participation. This is contrary to the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), the 2012 Local Planning Regulations, and the requirements of the Equality Act 2010. * Failure to Appropriately Advertise the Appeals/Consultation Process: Information on how citizens could respond or appeal was not appropriately advertised. Many residents were unaware of the process or how to submit comments. The reliance on online forms excluded those without internet access, while the single alternative — accessing a paper version in	No	Positive,Effe ctive,Justifie d,Consistent	2. Soundness I also do not consider the plan to be sound, as required under the NPPF, for the following reasons: a) Not Positively Prepared * The Plan ignores the severe flood risk facing Canvey Island. Concentrating growth here does not positively address local needs in a safe or sustainable manner. b) Not Justified * There is no evidence that West Canvey is the most appropriate location for such a large-scale allocation. * Other, less constrained sites exist within Castle Point that would be more suitable and safer for development. * The required flood risk Sequential Test does not appear to have been applied properly. c) Not Effective * Transport: The island has only two access routes, already heavily congested. Adding more housing and industry will worsen congestion and compromise emergency evacuation. * Infrastructure: No clear commitments exist for expanded healthcare, schools, emergency services, or utilities to support the additional population. * Parking: The proposed strategy to	To make the Plan legally compliant and sound, the following modifications must be made: 1. Consultation & Accessibility * Every household on Canvey Island must receive a direct letter explaining the consultation/appeals process, with both online and paper response options (freepost return included). * Consultation materials must be available in accessible formats (large print, easy-read) and distributed at multiple venues across Canvey (community centres, GP surgeries, schools, council offices), not just one library. * Drop-in events should be held locally so residents can ask questions face to face. 2. Transport & Evacuation * A new road connection off Canvey Island must be committed to within the Plan, to relieve congestion and provide a safe evacuation route in the event of a flood or industrial accident. * Development should be conditional on this road being completed before large-scale housing or industrial expansion takes place. 3. Healthcare & Education * New housing must be supported by additional GP	Not Sta ted		No		Objects to the scale of housing proposed for Canvey Island, citing flood risk, hazardous industry proximity, and lack of emergency access. • Argues that North West Thundersley (Blinking Owl site) is a more suitable strategic growth location due to better infrastructure and lower environmental constraints. • Criticises the Plan’s failure to demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing land supply, leaving Green Belt sites vulnerable to speculative development. • Challenges the soundness and legal compliance of the Plan under the NPPF, especially regarding the Duty to Cooperate and Sustainability Appraisal. • Calls for modifications to reduce pressure on	The Plan addresses flood risk, infrastructure, and development needs through INFRA policies and Policies SP3, C4, C10 and SD1, supported by the evidence base. Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground • North-West Thundersley: Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								the library — was unrealistic for residents with mobility issues, disabilities, caring responsibilities, or lack of transport. This approach does not meet the requirement for early, meaningful, and inclusive community engagement. * Habitats Regulations Assessment: Given West Canvey's proximity to the Thames Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, it is unclear whether the Habitats Regulations Assessment has properly assessed the full impacts of this scale of development. Failure to do so would render the Plan unlawful. * Flood Risk Compliance: The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires the application of the Sequential Test and Exception Test for flood risk. As Canvey Island is one of the most at-risk locations in the UK, the allocation of 500–1000 new homes here raises serious doubts that these tests have been correctly applied. The principle of sustainable development is not met, as the environmental and social harms clearly outweigh the claimed economic benefits. 3. Required Modifications 4. Conclusion For the reasons above, I request that Policy C4 – West Canvey be deleted from the Castle			consolidate parking is unrealistic and will increase pressure on already congested residential areas. * Industrial/Commercial Expansion: Proposals to increase industrial and commercial floor space by 10% lack clear evidence of demand and risk worsening air pollution, noise, and HGV traffic. d) Not Consistent with National Policy * The plan conflicts with NPPF flood risk policies (paras 159–169), which require directing development away from high-risk areas. * It also conflicts with NPPF biodiversity policies (paras 180–182), given the proximity to protected habitats. *	surgeries/doctors and at least one new primary school (with land safeguarded for a secondary school if needed). * Housing delivery must be phased alongside infrastructure provision, not left until afterwards. 4. Flood Risk Strategy * The Plan must include an updated flood risk strategy with upgraded defences, sustainable drainage, and an evacuation plan for residents. * The Sequential Test and Exception Test must be clearly evidenced and applied. 5. Parking & Local Services * Car parking standards must reflect the limited public transport available on the island. * Developer contributions (Section 106 or CIL) must be ring-fenced for services on Canvey Island (healthcare, schools, roads) rather than allocated elsewhere in the borough. 6. Biodiversity Protection * Strengthen protections for the Thames Estuary SPA/Ramsar site with buffer zones, green infrastructure, and mitigation measures. For the reasons above, I request that Policy C4 – West Canvey be deleted from the Castle Point Plan unless the modifications set out are adopted. Without them, the Plan is not legally compliant and not sound.					Canvey and include North West Thundersley.	allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. • Biodiversity: Covered under Policy ENV3 – Biodiversity and Nature Recovery, which includes mitigation and delivery mechanisms. • Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Point Plan unless the modifications set out are adopted.											
0 0 7 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Hel en	Davi s		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Justified, consistent with national policy			Not Sta ted		No		Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0 0 7 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joe	Davi s		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Justified, consistent with national policy			Not Sta ted		No		Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0 0 7 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ste ve	Woo d		Yes	C4	No		No	Justified, Consistent with National policy	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.		No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0 0 8 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Lyn ne	Cor nish		Yes	C4	No		No	Justified, Consistent with National policy	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.		No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0081-0002	Individual	Karen	Attenbury		Yes	C4	No		No	Justified, Consistent with National policy	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.		No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0087-0002	Individual	Christina	Watson		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Justified, consistent with national policy			No		No		Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0088-0002	Individual	Roy	Watson		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Justified, consistent with national policy			No		No		Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0090-0002	Individual	Sue	Greenway		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0091-0000	Individual	Corrine	Greenway		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02																			
0092-0002	Individual	Dave	Bailey		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0093-0002	Individual	Marilyn	Smith		Yes	C4	No	The proposed number of Canvey West homes puts residents to the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0095-0002	Individual	Donna	Bateman		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0096-0002	Individual	Cliff	Corrish		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0097-0	Individual	Dawn	Rumsey		Yes	C4	No		No	Justified, Consistent with National policy	The inclusion of Charfleet's Industrial Estate as a brownfield site for development into a mixed use of housing and industrial area has not fully considered	I believe the following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound 1. Add North West	No			B - see 0097-0003	Charfleets: Objects to the inclusion of Charfleet's Industrial Estate for development into a mixed use of	Charfleets: Charfleets Industrial Estate is included within Policy	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 2											the impact on the micro, small, medium and large businesses currently operating on the estate who are currently renting property or own their own site. There is no assessment of how they will be able to be operationally or financially continue to operate in said area. Should they be forced to move to new premises or have restrictions imposed upon their existing operations in the future due to the proximity of new residential properties. This policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement and officers have not engaged with the majority of the businesses currently on the Charfleet's Industrial Estate. The future plans of the Charfleet's Industrial Estate needs a fully supported, with full economic regeneration of the estate. There is no reasoned justification for using Charfleet's Industrial Estate for housing, with businesses integrated with residential homes.	Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. 2. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200 with Canvey at 1050 3. Remove Charfleet's Industrial Estate site from the plan Total Housing target of 11,000					housing and industrial. Has not fully considered the impact on the existing businesses. There has been poor engagement.	E1 which includes the statement 'the Council will seek to provide and retain Class E(g), B2 and B8 use classes or other 'sui generis' uses of a similar employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes	
0 0 9 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Da wn	Rum sey		Yes	C4					This plan clearly neglects the factor that Canvey Island has ONE ROAD OFF - The two roads converge at the waterside roundabout which causes issues at rush hour times and also should an incident occur - ie, broken down vehicle, vehicle		No			Non e	This plan clearly neglects the factor that Canvey Island has ONE ROAD OFF - The two roads converge at the waterside roundabout which causes issues at	Highways Impacts The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey,	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											involved in a RTA - The proposed number of dwellings as outline in your planning regulation would see on average - of 2 cars per dwelling an extra 6,000 vehicles using the two roads. Six thousand vehicles converging at the roundabouts and traffic lights - another reason as to why I consider this plan not to be legally prepared and sound. I can find no plans to build additional schools (primary and secondary), dentist surgeries, GP surgeries to accommodate the proposed additional residents for these new dwellings.						rush hour times and also should an incident occur - ie, broken down vehicle, vehicle involved in a RTA - The proposed number of dwellings as outline in your planning regulation would see on average - of 2 cars per dwelling an extra 6,000 vehicles using the two roads. Six thousand vehicles converging at the roundabouts and traffic lights - another reason as to why I consider this plan not to be legally prepared and sound. I can find no plans to build additional schools (primary and secondary), dentist surgeries, GP surgeries to accommodate the proposed additional residents for these new dwellings.	assessing impacts and recommending interventions. Flooding and infrastructure covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey.	
0098-0002	Individual	Lee	McGonagle		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
00	Individual	Susan	Saac		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes	Needs of emergency	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
99-0002								East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures									puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0100-0002	Individual	Terry	Morris		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0100-0002	Individual	Tina	Gregory		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0100-0002	Individual	Neil	Gregory		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0100-0002	Individual	Mary	Stevens		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0104-0002	Individual	Alan	Spiller		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0105-0002	Individual	Sonia	Dowsett		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0106-0002	Individual	Bernadette	Purcell		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0107-0002	Individual	Tracey	Empson		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0108-0000	Individual	Carol	Fisher		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02																			
0109-0002	Individual	Tim	McGinley		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0113-0002	Individual	D	Darlington		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0114-0002	Individual	Susan	Ross		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0115-0002	Individual	Laura	Webb		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	B - see 0115-0003	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0116-0	Individual	Oliiver	Smith		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
002																	evacuation procedures	Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0117-0002	Individual	Sarah	Bentley		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0118-0002	Individual	Rachel	Newcombe		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0119-0002	Individual	Carol	Welfare		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0120-0002	Individual	Barbara	Harrison		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0121-	Individual	Susannah	Miles		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0002																	evacuation procedures	Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0122-0002	Individual	Kathy	Phipps		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0123-0002	Individual	Victoria	Smith		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0124-0002	Individual	Adrian	Davis		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0125-0002	Individual	Daniel	Smart		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0126	Individual	Ryan	Morris		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with	Needs of emergency services considered in	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
-0002																	emergency evacuation procedures	the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0127-0002	Individual	Jack	Deal		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0128-0002	Individual	Charlie	Stocker		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0129-0002	Individual	Ian	Stewart Johnson		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0131-0002	Individual	Gemma	Cosgrove		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0133	Individual	Daniel	Tubwhit		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the	Needs of emergency services	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
2-0002			tington					with emergency evacuation procedures.									East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0134-0002	Individual	Bridie Anne	Kikeiros		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0135-0002	Individual	Hailey	Cregan		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0136-0002	Individual	Lorraine	Adams		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0137-0002	Individual	Gillian	Harper		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0138-0002	Individual	Jane	Davis		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0139-0002	Individual	Shelley	Neill		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0140-0002	Individual	Lee	Sumnerfield		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0141-0002	Individual	Sean	Marney		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0142-0000	Individual	Jemma	Roches		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02																			
0143-0002	Individual	Paul	Turnaine		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0144-0002	Individual	Samantha	Blewer		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0145-0002	Individual	Pat	Taylor		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0146-0002	Individual	Jacqueline	Cranfield		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0147-0	Individual	Bradley	Swann		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
002																	evacuation procedures	Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0148-0002	Individual	Paul	Williams		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0149-0002	Individual	Michael	Brown		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0150-0002	Individual	Jessica	Osborne		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0151-0002	Individual	Jan	Lewis		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0152-	Individual	Daphne	Brown		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0002																	evacuation procedures	Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0153-0002	Individual	Jani ce	Osborne		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0154-0002	Individual	Anne marie	Den nis		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0155-0002	Individual	Stephen	Osborne	Not stated	Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0156-0002	Individual	Ian	Whitlock		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0157	Individual	SJ	Murray		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with	Needs of emergency services considered in	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
-0002																	emergency evacuation procedures	the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0158-0002	Individual	CJ	Murray		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0161-0002	Individual	Norma	Blamey		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures, because although there are 2 roads to enter/exit the Island, they both meet at the same roundabout (Waterside Farm) and regularly gridlock at busy times or in the event of another activity away from the Island.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0162-0002	Individual	Gabriella	Kwilek		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		Housing target for Castle Point not met. The site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". The site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". NPPF guidelines	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2. All reasonable sites considered in both the supporting SLAA and SA processes. Flooding: Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	Y - Policy SD3(3) 'Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the constraints of the specific

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	state that development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. Sustainable Drainage measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. The 3,316+ urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	(SFRA). SUDs: Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	geographic location , site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex, the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and recommendations/advice from statutory bodies (including EA, Essex LLFA).'

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0164-0002	Individual	Paul	Harbord		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0168-0002	Individual	Barbara	Topham		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0175-0002	Individual	Laura	Long		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0176-0002	Individual	Debbie	Wood		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0177-0000	Individual	Desmond	Neville		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02																			
0178-0002	Individual	Wendy	Neville		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0179-0002	Individual	Tracy	Sewell		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0180-0002	Individual	Lyn da	Farrer		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0181-0002	Individual	Brian	Stone		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0182-00	Individual	Patricia	Beasley		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
002																	evacuation procedures	Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0183-0002	Individual	Dawn	Wheeler-Boreham		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0184-0002	Individual	Debbie	Harris		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0185-0002	Individual	Samantha	Duffield		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0190-0002	Individual	Margaret	Blamey		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0191-	Individual	Mark	Duffield		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0002																	evacuation procedures	Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0192-0002	Individual	Alyssa	Duffield		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0193-0002	Individual	Paul	Holland		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0194-0002	Individual	Louise	Holland		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0195-0002	Individual	Dulcie	McGovern		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0196	Individual	John	Steward		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with	Needs of emergency services considered in	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 2																	emergency evacuation procedures	the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0 1 9 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Car olin e	Wes t		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0 1 9 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Do nna	Gar ner		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0 1 9 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Juli a	Con nor		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0 2 0 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sue	Jack son		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0 2 0	Individual	Lis a	Hag gert y		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the	Needs of emergency services	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1-0002								with emergency evacuation procedures.									East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0202-0002	Individual	Claire	Fenlon		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0203-0002	Individual	Paul	Overbury		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0204-0002	Individual	Maeve	Johnstone		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0205-0002	Individual	Halley	Cockayne		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0206-0002	Individual	Simon	Stallwood		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0207-0002	Individual	Richard	Smitten		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0208-0002	Individual	Gavin	Culiff		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0209-0002	Individual	Pauline	Basford		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0210-0000	Individual	Andrew	Johnstone		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
02																			
0213-0002	Individual	Julie	Russell		Yes	C4	No	The proposed number of Canvey West homes puts residents to the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0215-0002	Individual	Jackie	Gross		Yes	C4	No	The proposed number of Canvey West homes puts residents to the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0217-0002	Individual	Steve	Desborough		Yes	C4	No	The 3,316+ urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2 1 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Gra ham	Brac ci		Yes	C4	Yes	3.01 The land to the south of Northwick Road has extant consent for employment development but this has been in place for many years due to a technical commencement but has not yet occurred. It appears that CPBC are confident that Housing development may be more forthcoming. This could be seen as being overly optimistic. A Housing development in close proximity to the proposed mixed industrial use development may offer little appeal, or confidence, to a potential new community of flat dwellers / home owners. 3.02 West Canvey is subject to the issues of potential Flood Risk, also the issues emanating from the Hazardous Industries which could potentially affect the rest of Canvey Island and its residents. 3.03 Being close to the sea defence the ground conditions may likely be affected by the high water table, which in itself may be influenced by saline water, indicating tidal water traversing beneath the sea defence could be a constraint on the construction of a Flatted development. Raising Ground Levels above the threat of Flooding may well	No	Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy	Summary Statement This representation is submitted in response to the Regulation 19 consultation on the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan 2026–2043. It is our view that the Plan fails all four tests of soundness as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Plan is underpinned by incomplete evidence, lacks consequence-based risk analysis, and proposes development in areas where public safety cannot be guaranteed—particularly on Canvey Island. 1. Is the Plan Positively Prepared ? The Plan is not positively prepared to meet the area’s objectively assessed development needs in a sustainable manner. It adopts a narrow urban-focused strategy that disproportionately exposes vulnerable communities, particularly on Canvey Island, to extreme risks. The prioritisation of Green Belt land over public safety concerns undermines the integrity of the planning process. The Plan selectively identifies flood risk constraints (Footnote 7) and then actively proposes		Yes	To introduce and explain any extra specific supporting evidence in relation to the matters raised in this submission during the Examination in Public (EiP) process		C	Underpinned by incomplete evidence, lacks consequence-based risk analysis, and proposes development in areas where public safety cannot be guaranteed—particularly on Canvey Island. The NPPF 2024 explicitly removes the ability for councils to set lower housing targets unless exceptional constraints are proven. While the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey. The Plan does not seek to meet development needs in a sustainable or safe manner. The primary housing site is not shovel-ready and faces significant delivery time constraints, undermining the Plan’s ability to meet urgent housing needs. The Plan is not deliverable without	Canvey Transport and Access The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. The Essex Transport Strategy ‘ A Better Connected Essex’ has set out a range of initiatives to improve access links to Canvey. Scheme Details can be found in Appendix A. South Essex Implementation Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								impact upon nearby land and property. 3.04 Some of the existing commercial users in the Charfleets area are themselves involved in heavy industrial activities, creating an undesirable area for a Housing development 3.05 The current new retail / commercial area, despite being popular amongst locals is extremely poorly served by public transport. It relies on a high majority of private car users. 3.06 Without significant infrastructure upgrades, environmental mitigation, and a shift in the surrounding land uses, the site risks becoming an isolated, high-cost enclave rather than a thriving community. 3.07 A phased or mixed-use Masterplan that buffers residential areas from heavy industry, integrates green space, and improves transport could make the scheme more viable, however, that would require substantial investment and coordination			development in those high-risk areas. The NPPF 2024 explicitly removes the ability for councils to set lower housing targets unless exceptional constraints are proven. While the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey. Conclusion: The Plan does not seek to meet development needs in a sustainable or safe manner. 2. Is the Plan Justified ? The Plan lacks proportionate evidence and fails to consider reasonable alternatives. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) omits site-specific modelling and consequencebased analysis for vulnerable populations. Hazardous installations and port-related activities are inadequately assessed, with no detailed COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards) consequence analysis provided. The plan increases population exposure in the vicinity of known COMAH sites hazard range consequence and flood-prone areas, without demonstrating that safer						significant risk to public safety and infrastructure capacity Without significant infrastructure upgrades, environmental mitigation, and a shift in the surrounding land uses, the site risks becoming an isolated, high-cost enclave rather than a thriving community.		

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
											alternatives were adequately considered. It fails to identify Canvey Island as a single flood cell requiring open space catchment areas for flood mitigation . Whilst the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey, despite failing to provide the required Level II SFRA Conclusion: The Plan is not based on proportionate evidence and fails to justify its spatial strategy. 3. Is the Plan Effective ? The Plan is not effective or deliverable given the known constraints. Major allocations such as West Canvey Island and the Seaview Road corridor lie within flood zones and lack infrastructure to support emergency planning. Pressures on roads and healthcare are acknowledged but not resolved through binding delivery mechanisms. The primary housing site is not shovel-ready and faces significant delivery time constraints, undermining the Plan’s ability to meet urgent housing needs. Conclusion: The Plan is not										

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											deliverable without significant risk to public safety and infrastructure capacity. 4. Consistent with National Policy ? The Plan fails to meet the housing targets set by the Standard Methodology and does not integrate consequence-based planning for flood risk or hazardous installations. This is contrary to NPPF guidance and Planning Practise Guidance on safe development and resilience. Furthermore, the Plan does not reflect legal duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 or COMAH Regulations to plan for foreseeable emergencies. Conclusion: The Plan is inconsistent with national policy and statutory obligations for riskinformed development. In light of the above, we respectfully request that the Castle Point Local Plan 2026–2043 be withdrawn or substantially revised to address the issues raised in this representation. The Plan must be re-evaluated to ensure it meets the tests of soundness, prioritises public safety, and complies with national policy and legal obligation. Is the Plan Legal ?									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											On the basis that this plan has been constructed by professional planners, we could not consider ourselves qualified to challenge its legality, subsequently we are compelled to respond "YES" to this question. However, this submission sets out to indicate that CPBC draft Reg19 consultation may well prove to be unsound or even illegal, being neither positively prepared nor adequately evidenced. The advice provided at 1.09 and 1.10 of this submission, has not been made lightly and goes some way to support our argument that adopting a wholly no Green Belt development policy, at the expense of public safety is somewhat perverse. Prioritising mainland Green Belt protection without fully accounting for major incident hazard range and the potential for catastrophic flood events on Canvey Island, effectively subdividing the borough’s communities, may make the draft CPBC Plan be deemed not only unreasonable but also unprincipled and corporately illogical.									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2 2 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ste ve	Saw kins		Yes	C4		3.01 The land to the south of Northwick Road has extant consent for employment development but this has been in place for many years due to a technical commencement but has not yet occurred. It appears that CPBC are confident that Housing development may be more forthcoming. This could be seen as being overly optimistic. A Housing development in close proximity to the proposed mixed industrial use development may offer little appeal, or confidence, to a potential new community of flat dwellers / home owners. 3.02 West Canvey is subject to the issues of potential Flood Risk, also the issues emanating from the Hazardous Industries which could potentially affect the rest of Canvey Island and its residents. 3.03 Being close to the sea defence the ground conditions may likely be affected by the high water table, which in itself may be influenced by saline water, indicating tidal water traversing beneath the sea defence could be a constraint on the construction of a Flatted development. Raising Ground Levels above the threat of Flooding may well	No	Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy	Summary Statement This representation is submitted in response to the Regulation 19 consultation on the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan 2026–2043. It is our view that the Plan fails all four tests of soundness as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Plan is underpinned by incomplete evidence, lacks consequence-based risk analysis, and proposes development in areas where public safety cannot be guaranteed—particularly on Canvey Island. 1. Is the Plan Positively Prepared ? The Plan is not positively prepared to meet the area’s objectively assessed development needs in a sustainable manner. It adopts a narrow urban-focused strategy that disproportionately exposes vulnerable communities, particularly on Canvey Island, to extreme risks. The prioritisation of Green Belt land over public safety concerns undermines the integrity of the planning process. The Plan selectively identifies flood risk constraints (Footnote 7) and then actively proposes		Yes	To introduce and explain any extra specific supporting evidence in relation to the matters raised in this submission during the Examination in Public (EiP) process		C	Underpinned by incomplete evidence, lacks consequence-based risk analysis, and proposes development in areas where public safety cannot be guaranteed—particularly on Canvey Island. The NPPF 2024 explicitly removes the ability for councils to set lower housing targets unless exceptional constraints are proven. While the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey. The Plan does not seek to meet development needs in a sustainable or safe manner. The primary housing site is not shovel-ready and faces significant delivery time constraints, undermining the Plan’s ability to meet urgent housing needs. The Plan is not deliverable without	Canvey Transport and Access The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. The Essex Transport Strategy ‘ A Better Connected Essex’ has set out a range of initiatives to improve access links to Canvey. Scheme Details can be found in Appendix A. South Essex Implementation Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								impact upon nearby land and property. 3.04 Some of the existing commercial users in the Charfleets area are themselves involved in heavy industrial activities, creating an undesirable area for a Housing development 3.05 The current new retail / commercial area, despite being popular amongst locals is extremely poorly served by public transport. It relies on a high majority of private car users. 3.06 Without significant infrastructure upgrades, environmental mitigation, and a shift in the surrounding land uses, the site risks becoming an isolated, high-cost enclave rather than a thriving community. 3.07 A phased or mixed-use Masterplan that buffers residential areas from heavy industry, integrates green space, and improves transport could make the scheme more viable, however, that would require substantial investment and coordination			development in those high-risk areas. The NPPF 2024 explicitly removes the ability for councils to set lower housing targets unless exceptional constraints are proven. While the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey. Conclusion: The Plan does not seek to meet development needs in a sustainable or safe manner. 2. Is the Plan Justified ? The Plan lacks proportionate evidence and fails to consider reasonable alternatives. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) omits site-specific modelling and consequencebased analysis for vulnerable populations. Hazardous installations and port-related activities are inadequately assessed, with no detailed COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards) consequence analysis provided. The plan increases population exposure in the vicinity of known COMAH sites hazard range consequence and flood-prone areas, without demonstrating that safer					significant risk to public safety and infrastructure capacity Without significant infrastructure upgrades, environmental mitigation, and a shift in the surrounding land uses, the site risks becoming an isolated, high-cost enclave rather than a thriving community.			

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											alternatives were adequately considered. It fails to identify Canvey Island as a single flood cell requiring open space catchment areas for flood mitigation · Whilst the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey, despite failing to provide the required Level II SFRA Conclusion: The Plan is not based on proportionate evidence and fails to justify its spatial strategy. 3. Is the Plan Effective ? The Plan is not effective or deliverable given the known constraints. Major allocations such as West Canvey Island and the Seaview Road corridor lie within flood zones and lack infrastructure to support emergency planning. Pressures on roads and healthcare are acknowledged but not resolved through binding delivery mechanisms. The primary housing site is not shovel-ready and faces significant delivery time constraints, undermining the Plan's ability to meet urgent housing needs. Conclusion: The Plan is not									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											deliverable without significant risk to public safety and infrastructure capacity. 4. Consistent with National Policy ? The Plan fails to meet the housing targets set by the Standard Methodology and does not integrate consequence-based planning for flood risk or hazardous installations. This is contrary to NPPF guidance and Planning Practise Guidance on safe development and resilience. Furthermore, the Plan does not reflect legal duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 or COMAH Regulations to plan for foreseeable emergencies. Conclusion: The Plan is inconsistent with national policy and statutory obligations for riskinformed development. In light of the above, we respectfully request that the Castle Point Local Plan 2026–2043 be withdrawn or substantially revised to address the issues raised in this representation. The Plan must be re-evaluated to ensure it meets the tests of soundness, prioritises public safety, and complies with national policy and legal obligation. Is the Plan Legal ?									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											On the basis that this plan has been constructed by professional planners, we could not consider ourselves qualified to challenge its legality, subsequently we are compelled to respond "YES" to this question. However, this submission sets out to indicate that CPBC draft Reg19 consultation may well prove to be unsound or even illegal, being neither positively prepared nor adequately evidenced. The advice provided at 1.09 and 1.10 of this submission, has not been made lightly and goes some way to support our argument that adopting a wholly no Green Belt development policy, at the expense of public safety is somewhat perverse. Prioritising mainland Green Belt protection without fully accounting for major incident hazard range and the potential for catastrophic flood events on Canvey Island, effectively subdividing the borough’s communities, may make the draft CPBC Plan be deemed not only unreasonable but also unprincipled and corporately illogical.									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0225-0002	Individual	Warren	Armstrong		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0240-0002	Individual	Helena	Sweeney		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0245-0002	Individual	Stephanie	Briggs		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0246-0002	Individual	Paul Leslie	Prosho		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0247-0000	Individual	Christine	Marshall		Yes	C4	No	The proposed number of Canvey West homes puts residents to the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02																			
0249-0002	Individual	Deborah	Bryant		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0250-0002	Individual	Anthony Shawn	Morley		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0251-0002	Individual	Amanda	Jacobs		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0253-0002	Individual	Karen	Howe		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0254-00	Individual	Cheryl	Sammons		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
002																	evacuation procedures	Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0255-0002	Individual	Scott	Spinks		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0259-0002	Individual	Zoe	Love day		Yes	C4	No	, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No	Not Stated	No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0260-0002	Individual	Natalie	Osborne		Yes	C4	No	, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated	Not Stated	No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0264-0002	Individual	Carole	Ferguson		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	Not Stated				No	Not Stated	No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1013-0004	Organisation	Tessa	Saunders	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Yes	C4	Yes		No	Effective	The proposal to concentrate significant growth on Canvey Island is underpinned by the SFRA Level 1 and 2 and supporting technical notes. Whilst we are aware of the challenges that tidal and surface water flood risk present, we consider that the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), are best placed to advise on the principle of whether these risks can be managed through suitable adaptation and mitigation measures, identified in the SFRA reports, and the recommendations proposed. Anglian Water considers that proposals for the densification of West Canvey would require a surface water drainage strategy to demonstrate the effective management of surface water flood risk across the site, with the priority for reuse and SuDS in accordance with the drainage hierarchy, and consistent with the requirements of Policy SD3. Our sewerage networks can be adversely affected by surface water flooding, which can cause further impacts such as hydraulic overloading – leading to spills and pollutions. Connection to our surface water sewer network should be the final option for	Policy C4 should require a surface water drainage strategy to demonstrate the effective management of surface water flood risk across the site, with the priority for reuse and SuDS in accordance with the drainage hierarchy, and consistent with the requirements of Policy SD3. The supporting text should also reference the need for pre-application engagement with Anglian Water if a connection to the public surface water sewerage system is proposed.	No	Not Answered		A	The proposal to concentrate significant growth on Canvey Island is underpinned by the SFRA Level 1 and 2 and supporting technical notes. Whilst we are aware of the challenges that tidal and surface water flood risk present, we consider that the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) are best placed to advise on the principle of whether these risks can be managed through suitable adaptation and mitigation measures, identified in the SFRA reports, and the recommendations proposed. Anglian Water considers that proposals for the densification of West Canvey would require a surface water drainage strategy to demonstrate the effective management of surface water flood risk across the site, with the priority for reuse and SuDS in	Mods proposed	Policy C4 - West Canvey Modification to Policy: New Paragraph 2. A surface water drainage strategy to demonstrate the effective management of surface water flood risk across the site, with the priority for reuse and SuDS in accordance with the drainage hierarchy. Modifications to Supporti

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required					
											discharge, if all other options are demonstrated to be infeasible. Our surface water guidance sets out our approach to different development scenarios. Reference to urban greening and the introduction of sustainable drainage is made in paragraph 8.39 of the supporting text, and pre-application discussions with the Lead Local Flood Authority. We would therefore expect the policy to reflect this approach in more specific terms or at least refer the need for compliance with Policy SD3. Moreover, the supporting text should also reference the need for pre-application engagement with Anglian Water if a connection to the public surface water sewerage system is proposed.							accordance with the drainage hierarchy, and consistent with the requirements of Policy SD3. Our sewerage networks can be adversely affected by surface water flooding, which can cause further impacts such as hydraulic overloading – leading to spills and pollutions. Connection to our surface water sewer network should be the final option for discharge, if all other options are demonstrated to be infeasible. Our surface water guidance sets out our approach to different development scenarios. Reference to urban greening and the introduction of sustainable drainage is made in paragraph 8.39 of the supporting text, and pre-application discussions with the Lead Local Flood Authority. We would therefore expect the policy to reflect this approach in more specific terms or at least refer the need for compliance with						ng Text 8.39 To ensure environmental quality, and to reduce the risks of adverse impacts from surface water, hydraulic overloading and pollution , it is expected that the regeneration of west Canvey will include urban greening and the introduction of sustainable drainage - must be supported by a surface water drainage

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	Policy SD3. Moreover, the supporting text should also reference the need for pre-application engagement with Anglian Water if a connection to the public surface water sewerage system is proposed. Proposed Modifications: Policy C4 should require a surface water drainage strategy to demonstrate the effective management of surface water flood risk across the site, with the priority for reuse and SuDS in accordance with the drainage hierarchy, and consistent with the requirements of Policy SD3. The supporting text should also reference the need for pre-application engagement with Anglian Water if a connection to the public surface water sewerage system is proposed.		strategy. The Strategy will be fully informed by engagement with key partners including the Environment Agency, Water utilities companies and Essex County Council (as Lead Local Flood Authority) and will prioritise consideration of SuDS and urban greening . 8.40 SuDS should be the principal but may

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			not be the only method. SuDs are often most viable when considered early in the design process, so developers are encouraged to engage in preapplication discussions with Essex County Council (as Lead Local Flood Authority), and refer to ECC's SuDS Design Guide, and any future updates, when preparing applications

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			incorporating SuDS schemes . These are critical to address the impacts of climate change in an urbanised environment and especially in a low-lying area such as Canvey. Furthermore, it is expected that the development will integrate with multi-functional green infrastructure in the area such as Canvey Wick

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			SSSI and west Canvey Marshes to provide recreation and time in nature opportunities for residents. Developers should engage with Anglian Water as early in the process as possible , if a connection to the public surface water sewerage system is proposed).
0281-0	Individual	DP	Mahoney		Not Stated	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0002																	evacuation procedures	Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0823-0006	Organisation	Pat	Abbott	Environment Agency	Yes	C4	Yes		Yes		We feel that some text should be incorporated into point 3 or point 6, to recognise the need for the Council and developers to provide adequate space for future maintenance activities relating to the two main river watercourses (Charfleets Dyke and Sluice Farm Dyke) within the Master planning requirements for this land allocation. Master Planning and re-development may provide opportunities to improve flood risk associated with the conveyance of Charfleets Dyke (especially within the Charfleets Industrial Estate) which has historically suffered from landowner culverting. Paragraph 172c of the NPPF advocates the taking of opportunities provided by new development and improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding. The policy and supporting text could recognise and aspire to the inclusion of this as an opportunity, perhaps within the body of Points 3 or Point 6 of Policy C4 – West Canvey. The council need to consider the challenges of overlapping timeframes will	We feel that some text should be incorporated into point 3 or point 6, to recognise the need for the Council and developers to provide adequate space for future maintenance activities relating to the two main river watercourses (Charfleets Dyke and Sluice Farm Dyke) within the Master planning requirements for this land allocation. Master Planning and re-development may provide opportunities to improve flood risk associated with the conveyance of Charfleets Dyke (especially within the Charfleets Industrial Estate) which has historically suffered from landowner culverting. Paragraph 172c of the NPPF advocates the taking of opportunities provided by new development and improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding. The policy and supporting text could recognise and aspire to the inclusion of this as an opportunity, perhaps within the body of Points 3 or Point 6 of Policy C4 – West Canvey. The council need to consider the challenges of overlapping timeframes will present between TE2100 aspirations for defence raising against	No	Not Answered		A	Wants to take the opportunity to ensure adequate space is provided for future maintenance of the two main watercourses (Charfleets Dyke and Sluice Farm Dyke). Recommends aspirations for improved flood risk associated with the conveyance of Charfleets Dyke (that has historically suffered from land owner culverting). Consider the challenges of timeframes with the TE2100 and encourages early engagement with the EA - this should be included within the reasoned justification.	Comments noted, see modifications proposed.	3. Improved public realm which prioritises pedestrian movements and creates spaces for community, civic and business activities. The public realm strategy should integrate urban greening and incorporate sustainable drainage into the approach to materials and landscaping. The inclusion of

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											present between TE2100 aspirations for defence raising against proposed housing delivery. We would promote early engagement between the council, developers and Environment Agency as the plans for West Canvey are developed so that the potential issues related to the overlapping timescales can be addressed at the earliest stage. This should be reflected in the reasoned justification/supporting text.	proposed housing delivery. We would promote early engagement between the council, developers and Environment Agency as the plans for West Canvey are developed so that the potential issues related to the overlapping timescales can be addressed at the earliest stage. This should be reflected in the reasoned justification/supporting text.							flood resilient design and opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding should also be considered where possible ." 8.39 added to end of paragrah . Early engagement with the environment agency is also recommended to consider the challenges of overlapping timeframes will present

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			between TE2100 aspirations for defence raising against proposed housing delivery.
0282-0010	Organisation	Kevin	Frasier	Essex County Council	Yes	C4	Not Stated		No	Positively prepared, justified, effective	1. Positively Prepared 2. Justified 3. Effective Please refer to the response to Policy Infra2 – Education, Skills and Learning, paragraph 19.20 with regards the ‘soundness’ of the Plan in education and Policy T1 in transportation terms. With regards Policy C4- West Canvey, this was previously assessed in education terms for 1,000 homes as highlighted in the IDP, May 2025. ECC indicated that a new primary school may be required along with a 56 and 30 place nursery. The policy has increased to 2,700 homes (of which 700 are beyond 2043) with only a requirement for a new 56 place stand-alone early years and childcare nursery and additional primary school provision as required.	ECC will need to undertake a cumulative assessment of the growth, prior to submission, consistent with Section 3.4 of the Essex County Council Local and Neighbourhood Planners’ Guide to School Organisation and Place Planning (February 2025) to inform an updated IDP. Any cumulative assessment will need to inform the Plan, site policies, an amended IDP and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. ECC needs to ensure that the delivery of ECC’s infrastructure and services are commensurate with the growth being planned. Further assessment will be undertaken to support individual planning applications once the detailed housing mix has been determined by the developer. ECC require Criteria 10 is amended to read: Development proposals must	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Education Needs were assessed based on a lower number of housing at West Canvey, as highlighted in the IDP May 2025. A further assessment using the latest housing strategy is required to assess the impact of growth at West Canvey on primary, secondary, early years education and childcare and SEND provision for 2,700 homes at West Canvey and this policy and the IDP will be updated according to the results of that assessment. In January 2026, ECC provided addendums to the education	Accepted. CPBC will work with ECC to undertake a further assessment to identify the necessary primary, secondary, early years education and childcare and SEND provision for 2,700 homes at West Canvey and the IDP will be updated according to the results of that assessment. In January 2026, ECC provided addendums to the education	Remove criteria 8 and replace with A new 72 56 place stand-alone early years and childcare nursery (Use Class E(f)) on 0.22 ~~0.13~~ hectares of suitable land and a new 56 place stand-alone early years

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											No specific land is allocated for a new school (F1) use. However, the provision of 2,700 homes will require at least a new 2FE primary school with the provision of land and contributions towards three new 72 place nurseries, of which one should be co-located with the primary school (see Appendix 4). ECC support the requirement for a masterplan, approved by CPBC, to be in place prior to the submission of a planning application. Masterplans should encourage a landscape-led approach to design to ensure that GBI, biodiversity, and climate resilience, and the ELNRS are considered from the outset, shaping development around the natural environment rather than retrofitting it. ECC support the promotion of urban greening in criteria 3 and 9 and the delivery and connection to GI to the west of the site. ECC support reference in Criteria 10, to requirements for development design to support the habitat priority measures identified in the Strategic Combined Opportunity Areas but recommend an amendment to reflect the correct terminology Should reference also be made to protecting areas	be designed to enable and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Combined Opportunity Areas Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (ELNRS).					led design approach to master planning with early on consideration of ELNRS. Supports promotion of urban greening within the policy. Suggests referencing the protection of APIBs to be consistent with Policy SP1.	assessments previously undertaken in November 2025. Accepted. GBI, biodiversity and climate change should be considered at the outset of any development design. Additional reference to `protect and enhance` Strategic Combined Opportunity Areas` consistent with proposed change to Policy SP1 and to `protect` APIBs	and childcar e nursery (Use Class E(f)) on 0.18 hectares of suitable land allocate d for educatio n and childcar e use provisio n Amend Criteria 10 to read: Develop ment proposal s must be designed to protect and enhance ~~enable~~ ~~and~~ ~~support~~ the habitat priority measure s identifie d within

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											identified as Areas of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (APIBs) consistent with Policy SP1, if there are such sites at this location.								the Strategic Combined Opportunity Areas Opportunities as well as protect Areas of Biodiversity Importance set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (ELNRS).
0285-0002	Individual	Karen	Page		Yes	C4	No	Canvey west homes puts residents in the east at risk with emergency evacuations procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The 3316+ urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey west homes puts residents in the east at risk with emergency evacuations procedures.	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0286-0002	Individual	Brian	Percy		Yes	C4	No	Canvey west homes puts residents in the east at risk with emergency evacuations procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The 3316+ urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey west homes puts residents in the east at risk with emergency evacuations procedures.	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0287-0002	Individual	Gary	West		Yes	C4	No	, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	No	Not Stated			No		No	A	The 3316+ urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey west homes puts residents in the east at risk with emergency evacuations procedures. Objects to allowing mixed use on Charfleets.	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Charfleets: Charfleets Industrial Estate is included within Policy E1 which includes the statement ' the Council will seek to provide and retain Class E(g), B2 and B8 use classes or other 'sui generis' uses of a similar employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes'	N
0290-0000	Individual	DJ	Traer		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
02																		Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0291-0002	Individual	IA	Traer		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0298-0002	Individual	Alan	Tibbit		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0299-0002	Individual	Carol	Crawley		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0301-0002	Individual	Tracey	Laughton		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 0 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Kiet h	Ride r		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No		The draft local plan is not justified and consistent with national policy. It doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. The site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. The selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". The site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not all sites have been considered. No Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, specifically with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state that development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. Sustainable Drainage measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not	<u>Y - Policy SD3(3)</u> 'Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the constraints of the specific geographic location , site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex, the

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	The 3,316+ urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey</u> belt covered under policy GB2. <u>Flood Risk and Infrastructure</u> Flooding and infrastructure covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstance s and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA. <u>Emergency Services</u> Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting	Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and recommendations/advic e from statutory bodies (including EA, Essex LLFA).'

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0303-0002	Individual	Niki	Stoker		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0305-0002	Individual	Rita	Stoker		Yes	C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 0 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mat the w	Mille r		Yes	C4	No	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated			No		No		Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley No credible five-year housing land supply. Ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. North West Thundersley site excluded NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, The proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. Charfleets Industrial estate inclusion as a brownfield site for development into a mixed use housing and industrial area	<u>Housing Supply</u> : See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition,	Y - Policy SD3(3) 'Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the constraints of the specific geographic location , site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex, the

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	has not fully considered the impact on micro, small, medium and large businesses currently operating on the estate that are currently renting property or own their own site. The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Remove Charfleets Industrial Estate site from the plan. Total housing target of 11,000.	Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey belt</u> covered under policy GB2. <u>Flood Risk and Infrastructure</u> Flooding and infrastructure covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDS and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the	Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and recommendations/advice from statutory bodies (including EA, Essex LLFA).'

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		SFRA. <u>Emergency Services</u> Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). <u>Charfleets Industrial Estate</u> is included within Policy E1 which includes the statement ' the Council will seek to provide and retain Class E(g), B2 and B8 use classes or other 'sui generis' uses of a similar employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 1 0 - 0 0 0 8	Individual	Martin	Engl and		Yes	C4			No	Justified, consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number		Yes	As Hea d of the Sav e Had leig h Far mla nd Gro up I wou ld like to put the cas e for war d as to why our site is still at risk with a loc al pla n that will be fou nd uns	No	A	Charfleets Industrial estate: No reasoned justification for using the Charfleets Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes. Remove Manor Trading Industrial Estate site from the plan. Remove Charfleets Industrial Estate site from the plan.	Charfleets Industrial Estate is included within Policy E1 which includes the statement 'the Council will seek to provide and retain Class E(g), B2 and B8 use classes or other 'sui generis' uses of a similar employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. The inclusion of the Charfleets Industrial estate as a brownfield site for development into a mixed use housing and industrial area has not fully considered the impact on micro, small, medium and large businesses currently operating on the estate that are currently renting property or own their own site, there is no assessment			ound, which will then lead to speculative development across our precious Greenbelt sites. Also, the over development with this plan will cause unt					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											of how they will be able to operationally or financially continue to operate, should they be forced to move to new premises or have restrictions placed on their existing operations in the future, due to the proximity of new residential properties. This policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority on the businesses on the Charfleets Industrial estate. The future plans for Charfleets Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Charfleets Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.			old issues to the local urban areas, when there are viable sites available which have not been seriously considered, like NW Thundersley. Also, as a					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														Co mm itte e Me mb er for the Frie nds of Can vey Lak e gro up I wou ld like to put the cas e for war d as to why our lake is still at risk with this pla n that put s ove					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														r thre e tho usa nds hou ses on Can vey Isla nd, but whe n fou nd uns oun d, will lea d to spe cul ativ e dev elo pm ent acr oss our pre cio us Gre enb elt site s, with the					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														additional houses on our Grey Belt sites on Canvey, where there are viable sites available which have not been seriously considered, like NW Thundersley.					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0316-0002	Individual	Amy	Thompson			C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated						A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0317-0002	Individual	Brian	O'Grady			C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated							The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0320-0002	Individual	John	Wellmen			C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not stated							The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0321-0002	Individual	Amy	Bailey			C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not stated							The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0325-000	Individual	Ami	Philips			C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not stated							The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02																			
0326-0002	Individual	Ross	Day			C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not stated						A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0336-0007	Organisation	Caroline	Peters	Essex Police		C4	Not Stated	The DOCO acknowledges the site will provide approximately '2,700 new homes, employment, associated community facilities and open space provision' and that this development will be subject to a Master Plan, (specifically regarding the improvement to public realm). It is recommended that the DOCO is consulted during the preparation for the Master Plan.	Not Stated							A	It is recommended that the DOCO is consulted during the preparation for the Master Plan.	This site will be assessed under policy D1 which includes opportunities for design out crime to be taken.	N
0351-0002	Individual	Jade	Day			C4	No	. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	Not Stated							A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 3 2 - 0 0 0 7	Agent	Cor in	Willi ams	Icen i OBO The Inne r Lon don Gro up		C4					2.3 Inner London agrees with the broad intentions of the draft policy but objects to the policy on the basis that it is not compatible with the existing uses and permissions that are located within it. Point 7 states that the Master Plan will provide “a programme of renewal of the existing building stock at West Canvey and an overall increase in commercial floorspace of 10%” but fails to recognise that that a strategy which seeks only to renew existing provision will mean that existing businesses will need to be displaced while the construction works take place. This means that, despite having aims to “increase industrial floorspace by 10%”, this policy is likely to reduce industrial provision in the short term, especially as no additional employment land has been identified in the emerging plan to “decant” these business to while the old stock is renewed, and noting the critically low vacancy levels in Castle Point highlighted in our previous representations. 2.4 It is for these reasons that the policy should extend the “Broad Location” allocation to include the sites identified in Option 2a of the Sustainability Appraisal as being suitable for “limited release”. The 5	2.5 Additionally, the policy text for Policy C4 makes no reference to the extant, permitted development at the Northwick Site (15/0293/RES), despite this land being included within the wider allocation. This omission creates ambiguity regarding the intended role of the Northwick Site within the allocation and risks implying that alternative uses identified in Policy C4 e.g. residential and community uses, are appropriate on this land, contrary to the established planning position. 2.8 The omission of the Northwick Site’s established role and permitted development within Policy C4 is therefore misleading and therefore “unjustified” in the tests for soundness. It inaccurately suggests that the residential and community uses proposed elsewhere within the allocation may also be achievable or supported on the Northwick Site, when in fact no such uses are deliverable or being promoted. 2.9 Policy C4 should be amended to explicitly support employment uses, consistent with the extant permission, at the Northwick Site. This would ensure the policy accurately reflects the site’s development context and avoids creating false					Agrees with the broad intentions of policy C4 Objects that the proposal conflicts with existing uses Displacement while construction works are taking place Extend the broad location to include the 5 sites identified in option 2a of the SA provide additional floorspace Remove inclusion of alternative uses ie residential and community uses. Exclude development at the Northwick site (15/0293/RES) as the policy does not reflect the existing permission	Support noted. Conflicts with existing uses Policy C4 seeks a masterplan approach that will provide a land use strategy that identifies how a mix of uses comprising residential, community, commercial and industrial can be accomodated whilst ensuring residential amenity and avoiding harm to economic activity. Displacement during works This broad location is not likely to be developed all in one go, taking a strategic look at the whole area allows a comprehensive and hollistic approach to regeneration however the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											sites it identifies will provide additional land to meet a greater percentage of the borough's unmet housing and employment need as well as providing well located, sustainable locations to which existing businesses at Charfleets Industrial Park can be "decanted" while the old stock is renewed. Without these proposed changes, Policy C4 will not be effective or positively prepared, and therefore the plan will not be sound.	expectations or policy conflict.						implementation is likely to be done in phases. The logistics of the construction work and the impact that this has on existing occupiers will be detailed in a construction environment management plan prepared and submitted to the council in accordance with policy SD6. Extend the Broad Location The sustainability appraisal details why these options have not been selected. It should also be noted that it is green belt land which has many constraints as detailed in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper Remove other uses	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		The policy is intended to bring regeneration and renewal to the area which will optimise urban land use and improve the quality of the urban environment and public realm. This includes ensuring that the area has public services and community uses as well as residential development. Exclude Northwick site from the broad location This site has been included within the broad location so that effective links can be created within the area.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0750-0001	Individual	Sean	Quartermaine	N/A	Yes	C4	No	S.4 of the Castle Point Statement of Community Involvement 2020 states that, subject to reasonable cost and time constraints, safe and effective engagement methods would be utilised. The overwhelming majority of people on Canvey did not know about the Issues & Options consultation or this Regulation 19 consultation. The former was advertised on social media (most residents wouldn't see it), within an advertising booklet (even if received, most people never read these), and some people on Canvey received a bespoke booklet just focusing on the plan (brilliant method, should have been used for Reg. 19 too!) but it was not clear on the front of this booklet that this related to mass development so most people would not know the value of engagement as demonstrated by the extremely low response rate. Also, there was a severely disproportionately low number of engagement sessions booked for Canvey Island relative to its population. The latter seems only to have been advertised on social media, and with less than 3 weeks to go before the consultation closes it	No	Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Effective - this plan is not deliverable due to its reliance upon C4 West Canvey Employment area. The suggestion to simultaneously increase the floorspace for commercial/industrial use as well as redesignate a large enough area to add thousands of dwellings is not clearly explained. More specifically, it is not explain what the new layout of this large area would be, who would pay for it, what happens to the existing businesses, and more. This is not a durable proposal. Consistent with national policy - C4 West Canvey Employment area is not a sustainable development for economic reasons. It severely limits the available area for expansion of commercial/industrial areas whilst simultaneously the plan is reducing such areas (e.g. Canvey Supply) elsewhere in the plan. The last local plan (1998-2003) designed the land for employment some of which was only developed much later on. This change of designation relies upon the unrealistic hope that the layout of the commercial/industrial units might change and that they might not actually use the current surplus land in the future. It also Creates a long-	Legal Compliance: 1) Immediately get information on the consultation posted to every residence in Castle Point. 2) Provide clear alternatives to the online form for residents to raise comments, suggestions, and objections. Sound: 3) Remove C4 West Canvey employment area from the draft plan. 4) Add North-West Thundersley to the draft plan, maximise residential allocations there, provide the obvious infrastructure connections on the A127, A1245, and A130 (I would suggest another roundabout near the Rayleigh Spur where the current slip road is, or underpasses/flyovers) as well as other reasonable connections.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Lack of publication of the consultation Concerned about the redevelopment of Charfleets Suggesting North West Thundersley as an alternative	Consultation advertisement Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations and has advertised the consultations through numerous mediums and platforms. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. Charfleets Charfleets Industrial Estate is included within Policy E1 which includes the statement ' the Council will seek to provide and retain Class E(g), B2 and B8 use classes or other 'sui generis' uses of a similar	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
								seems clear this is deliberate so that Canvey residents are not aware of the new addition after the last consultation to add thousands of extra flats to the plan just for Canvey. It is not reasonable or appropriate to expect residents to do the council's job for it to raise awareness of the consultation. Also, the consultation form is difficult for less technically-able people to use, and due to the lack of proper information being sent to residents it is not clear what alternative methods there are to provide a consultation response. This failure to use effective methods of consultation mean the council has failed the to carry out the drafting of the plan in compliance in line with its Statement of Community Involvement.			term inefficiency in planning on Canvey Island and would force encroachment on the green belt for the next local plan. Justified - North-West Thundersley (Blinking Owl) is a far more reasonable and appropriate location. It can facilitate large-scale residential development which alone could exceed the borough's objectively assessed needs whilst minimising the severe infrastructure problems which overdeveloping Canvey would cause, especially to the road network and inevitable pressures on Canvey's sole exit bottle-neck for private and public vehicles to use at Waterside Farm roundabout. The council instead should have maximised the development potential for North-West Thundersley which would allow a longer-term Local Plan to be enacted and more certainty given to property developers for what can be built in Castle Point.								employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes'. This policy will apply until such time as a master plan for West Canvey has been developed. Policy E1 may subsequently change in terms of its approach to Charfleets when the Castle Point Plan is reviewed in 5 years' time, to enable the delivery of the West Canvey regeneration. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	
0385-0002	Individual	Lukas	Burry		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergancy evacuation procedures.					A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0386-0000	Individual	Delia	Searle		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergancy evacuation procedures.					A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02																		Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0387-002	Individual	Bernard	Searle		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.					A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0388-002	Individual	Tracy	Searle		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.					A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0389-002	Individual	Harvey	Burroughs		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.					A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0390-002	Individual	Stacy	Sibthorp		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0391-0	Individual	Perry	Hall		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
002																	evacuation procedures	Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0392-002	Individual	Dave	Wahs		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.					A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0393-002	Individual	Terence	Salter		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0402-002	Individual	Janet	Parish		Yes	C4	No				The proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0403-002	Individual	Lesley	Thompson		Yes	C4	No				The proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0404-	Individual	Janice	Barnes		Yes	C4	No				The proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0002											with emergency evacuation procedures.						evacuation procedures	Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0405-0002	Not Answered	Nicola	Turp		Yes	C4	No				The proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0406-0002	Not Answered	Carol	Turp		Yes	C4	No				The proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0407-0002	Not Answered	Deirdre	Perry		Yes	C4	No				The proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0408-0002	Individual	Trevor	Higgins		Yes	C4	No				The proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.					A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0409	Individual	Betty	Higgins		Yes	C4	No				The proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts					A	The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with	Needs of emergency services considered in	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
-0002											residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						emergency evacuation procedures	the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0410002	Individual	Margaret	Bowden		Yes	C4	No				The proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0468003	Individual	Philip	Bournes		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0469002		Colby	Cunningham		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0470002		Cheryl	Ray		Yes	C4	No				The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
048	Individual	Teresa	Goodman		Yes	C4					The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts		No				The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the	Needs of emergency services	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
5-0002											residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0486-0002	Individual	Lorraine	Buckley		Yes	C4					The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.		No				The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0487-0002	Individual	Graham	Thomas		Yes	C4					The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0488-0002	Individual	Gillian	Bouchreau		Yes	C4					The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0341-0008	Organisation	Janet	Nuttall	Natural England		C4	Yes	8.39 states that 'development will integrate with multi-functional green infrastructure in the area such as Canvey Wick SSSI and west Canvey Marshes to provide recreation and time in nature opportunities for residents'. This will need careful consideration to ensure that there are no harmful impacts on the notified features of Canvey Wick SSSI from new development. Please note that assessments on SSSIs are separate considerations from impacts on international sites which are carried out under the Habitats Regulations as mentioned in 8.40.	Yes							A	Policy C4 - West Canvey	8.39 states that 'development will integrate with multi-functional green infrastructure in the area such as Canvey Wick SSSI and west Canvey Marshes to provide recreation and time in nature opportunities for residents'. This will need careful consideration to ensure that there are no harmful impacts on the notified features of Canvey Wick SSSI from new development. Please note that assessments on SSSIs are	8.39 Furthermore, it is expected that the development will integrate with multi-functional green infrastructure in the area such as Canvey Wick SSSI and west Canvey Marshes to provide recreation and time in nature opportunities for residents, whilst

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		separate considerations from impacts on international sites which are carried out under the Habitats Regulations as mentioned in 8.40. However, further mods are proposed, as follows: 8.39 Furthermore, it is expected that the development will integrate with multi-functional green infrastructure in the area such as Canvey Wick SSSI and west Canvey Marshes to provide recreation and time in nature	ensuring that there are no harmful impacts on the notified features of Canvey Wick SSSI from new development. <u>Modifications to Policy: C4</u> ~~9. Appropriate links in to multi-functional green infrastructure to the west of the site whilst~~

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		opportunities for residents, whilst ensuring that there are no harmful impacts on the notified features of Canvey Wick SSSI from new development. <u>Modifications to Policy:C4</u> 9. Appropriate links into multi-functional green infrastructure to the west of the site whilst avoiding adverse harm to biodiversity through recreational impacts, or other impacts arising from urban development.	avoiding adverse harm to biodiversity through recreational impacts, or other impacts arising from urban development. - 9) Well-designed alternative SANG, to help alleviate pressure on the Essex Coast habitats 10) A strate

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		9) Well-designed alternative SANG, to help alleviate pressure on the Essex Coast habitats 10) A strategy that minimizes impacts upon the SSSI and does not impede LNRS aims of connectivity; via sensitive consideration of siting, buffers, lighting and noise. Residential development should be located with suitable buffers and in less sensitive	gy that minimizes impacts upon the SSSI and does not impede LNRS aims of connectivity; via sensitive consideration of siting, buffers, lighting and noise. Residential development should be located with suitable buffers and in less sensitive

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		parts of the site to avoid adverse impacts 11) Enhancements that complement the designated features and features of interest of Canvey Wick SSSI. Redevelopment of the adjacent area should factor in features that we will support increased biodiversity, in particular scarce and rare invertebrates, via measures such as green roofs, brownfield habitat, sandy planted	ve parts of the site to avoid adverse impacts 11) Enhancements that complement the designated features and features of interest of Canvey Wick SSSI. Redevelopment of the adjacent area should factor in features that we will support increa

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		areas/sand banks and use of waste material such as crushed concrete in gabion baskets.	sed biodiv ersity, in partic ular scarce and rare inverte brates, via measu res such as green roofs, brown field habitat , sandy plante d areas/ sandb anks a nd use of waste materi al such as crushe d concre te in gabion basket s.

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 7 2 5 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Jan et	Dun ford		Yes	C4	No	For the Castle Point Plan to be legally compliant, it must satisfy the statutory obligations set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024). While I recognise the effort that has gone into preparing the Regulation 19 draft, there are several areas where, in my view, the Plan does not yet meet the legal tests of soundness and compliance, and these must be addressed before submission for examination. Perhaps most critically, the Council has not yet demonstrated a deliverable five-year housing land supply, as required under paragraph 78 of the NPPF. This is not a mere technicality; it is a fundamental test of the Plan’s soundness and credibility. Policy SP3 fails to establish a deliverable five-year supply of housing land—whether measured against the Government’s housing targets or the Council’s own lower assessed need. The absence of a transparent, evidenced, and up-to-date supply not only undermines the Plan’s justification but also leaves all of Castle Point’s Green Belt—land which may come	No	Consistent with national policy	Flood Risk and Inadequate Drainage • The proposed development of 3,143 homes is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, areas with a high probability of flooding as defined by the Environment Agency. • Two major hazard sites—Calor Gas and Oikios—are situated nearby, compounding risk in the event of flooding or emergency evacuation. • The 2013/14 internal flooding event demonstrated the island’s vulnerability. Following that event, the official report recommended that all drains be properly maintained to mitigate recurrence. • The 2017 Technical Report on Canvey Lake confirmed that the drainage system is inadequate for current and future capacity. • The Local Plan’s technical assessment itself acknowledges that “special drainage is critical for Canvey because it is a low-lying area vulnerable to climate change.” • Independent flood experts have stated that every assessed site on Canvey has a “high probability of flooding.” • Planning law and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) require that local authorities: “Locate development in areas of lowest flood risk	The proposed Canvey Island development contradicts the principles of sustainable development under the NPPF, which mandates that safety, resilience, and flood risk must be primary considerations. Proceeding without a full flood assessment and infrastructure plan exposes residents, businesses, and emergency services to unacceptable risk. A geological survey, of the site, transport links improved along with road infrastructure. Build in North West Thundersley	Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	C	Five Year Housing Land Supply Flood Risk on Canvey Oil and Gas causing threat to safety No Flood Risk Assessment Air Quality North West Thundersley should be built on instead	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government’s Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government’s Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required							
								under pressure for development—critically exposed to speculative proposals, including on sites that are environmentally sensitive or constrained by inadequate infrastructure. Flood Risk and Inadequate Drainage • The proposed development of 3,143 homes is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, areas with a high probability of flooding as defined by the Environment Agency. • Two major hazard sites—Calor Gas and Oikios—are situated nearby, compounding risk in the event of flooding or emergency evacuation. • The 2013/14 internal flooding event demonstrated the island’s vulnerability. Following that event, the official report recommended that all drains be properly maintained to mitigate recurrence. • The 2017 Technical Report on Canvey Lake confirmed that the drainage system is inadequate for current and future capacity. • The Local Plan’s technical assessment itself acknowledges that “special drainage is critical for Canvey because it is a low-lying area vulnerable to climate change.” • Independent flood			and demonstrate there are no reasonable alternatives before permitting building in Flood Zones 2 or 3.” No comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has yet been completed for these sites. 2. Infrastructure and Transport Capacity • The existing road network is severely constrained, with both access roads leading to a single congested roundabout. • No clear transport improvement plan or confirmed funding mechanism has been provided to address increased traffic volumes from the proposed development. • The absence of robust infrastructure planning raises significant safety, access, and evacuation concerns, particularly during flood events. 3. Alternative and Safer Development Sites • The North Benfleet site offers a safer and more sustainable alternative, as it is not within a flood zone. • A potential link to the A127 could be incorporated into the planned junction upgrade, and Essex County Council draft plans demonstrate the feasibility of this connection. • The current plan prioritizes green belt and grey belt preservation over public														Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council’s aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d			
								experts have stated that every assessed site on Canvey has a “high probability of flooding.” • Planning law and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) require that local authorities: “Locate development in areas of lowest flood risk and demonstrate there are no reasonable alternatives before permitting building in Flood Zones 2 or 3.” No comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has yet been completed for these sites. 2. Infrastructure and Transport Capacity • The existing road network is severely constrained, with both access roads leading to a single congested roundabout. • No clear transport improvement plan or confirmed funding mechanism has been provided to address increased traffic volumes from the proposed development. • The absence of robust infrastructure planning raises significant safety, access, and evacuation concerns, particularly during flood events. 3. Alternative and Safer Development Sites • The North Benfleet site offers a safer and more sustainable alternative, as it is not within a flood zone.			safety and flood resilience, contrary to planning policy that requires flood risk and infrastructure adequacy to take precedence. The air does not meet the air pollution standards for homes and young families The proposed Canvey Island development contradicts the principles of sustainable development under the NPPF, which mandates that safety, resilience, and flood risk must be primary considerations. Proceeding without a full flood assessment and infrastructure plan exposes residents, businesses, and emergency services to unacceptable risk.										be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper. Flood Risk on Canvey Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is substantially defended from flooding. The recommendations of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment do not seek to restrict the overall level of development in the borough, including on Canvey, but aim to direct the location of development and/or the	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required			
								• A potential link to the A127 could be incorporated into the planned junction upgrade, and Essex County Council draft plans demonstrate the feasibility of this connection. • The current plan prioritizes green belt and grey belt preservation over public safety and flood resilience, contrary to planning policy that requires flood risk and infrastructure adequacy to take precedence. The proposed Canvey Island development contradicts the principles of sustainable development under the NPPF, which mandates that safety, resilience, and flood risk must be primary considerations. Proceeding without a full flood assessment and infrastructure plan exposes residents, businesses, and emergency services to unacceptable risk.													design of development to minimise exposure to flood risk. Furthermore, flooding and the need for flood management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4, SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the plan, and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey.	Oil and Gas on the Island As set out in Plan paragraph 8.28 ‘Both port facilities are registered as Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) sites due to the hazardous nature of the goods that they receive and store. The Health and Safety

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Executive (HSE) and the Environment Agency are responsible for regulating activities at these sites, and also provide advice on the level of hazard the installations pose to nearby development. Both installations have HSE consultation zones identified around them, in which it is expected that other development is controlled to limit unnecessary harm to life and property. The extent of these zones is determined by the nature of the goods received and stored on site, and the technical measures employed to ensure safety at the sites. It is therefore	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		possible that the level of hazard posed to other developments nearby can be reduced, both by limiting development nearby, and also by seeking improvements to the level of hazard posed by these sites, both during normal management and maintenance, and also at the point where new development is proposed.' The current HSE consultation zones are indicated on the policies map. The plan doesn't propose any new housing allocations in the HSE consultation zone. However, some existing residential areas are	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		already within the zone, as well as the Thorney Bay Park Homes site. Policy SD8 ‘Development near Hazardous Uses’ states that ‘Development proposals will be assessed in accordance with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Guidance where they fall within a consultation zone for one or more hazardous installations. Where the HSE advises against development the planning application will be refused on health and safety grounds’. Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 and Level 2 Flood	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Risk Assessments are available to view on the Councils Website. Air Quality Air quality impacts are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal, under objective 9.1. Annual Status Reports for Castle Point can be found on the Essex Air website along with further information relating to air quality within Castle Point. Castle Point monitor nitrogen dioxide using diffusion tubes at 30 monitoring locations around the district. The main source of pollution in the Borough is road traffic emissions from major roads, notably	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		the A13, A127 and A130. The Council has not declared any Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). Generally, air pollution is low in Castle Point. Results from the monitoring points across the Borough suggest that air quality is improving. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 4 4 0 - 0 0 0 6	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	C4	Yes		No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Depending on where the 2000 new homes are located within this allocation, and the approach taken to the non-residential construction, there could be serious negative impacts on Canvey Wick Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), including to key populations of Essex Local Nature Recovery Scheme (LNRS) Priority Species Nightingale and Shril Carder Bee. There must be no increase in harmful recreational impacts on this SSSI or to the RSPB reserve. Paragraph 8.39 states the aim for Canvey Wick SSSI and West Canvey Marsh to help "provide recreation". Canvey Wick has experienced fires and other recreational damage in recent years, and this sensitive and important site must be safeguarded with a suitable buffer zone and other mitigation measures. Other issues affecting the site and its biodiversity include artificial light pollution, disturbance to wildlife, and nutrient deposition to the specialised nutrient-sensitive flora from dog waste. Measures to prevent new residential areas being built near the SSSI, and to discourage direct access onto the SSSI area from any new residential development that is built in the broad	The RSPB is greatly concerned about the plans in Policy C4 for a broad location next to Canvey Wick SSSI and near West Canvey Marsh RSPB reserve, especially the 2000 homes. Canvey Wick SSSI is nationally important for invertebrates, and important for species such as Nightingale, and therefore a source of pride for Castle Point. There is great responsibility for its appropriate treatment. We urge that any new housing be located at the eastern end of the broad location, well away from the vulnerable wildlife, and with business or industrial units separating new residential buildings from the SSSI. There should be no added lighting, pollution, and disturbance impacts. To avoid harm to the SSSI and West Canvey Marsh RSPB reserve, please clarify Policy C4 as follows: 1) Clarify that any new residential units (2000 homes) will be allocated to the eastern end of the broad location zone, well away from the SSSI and surrounding area, ideally outside a buffer zone of 400m; 2 Clarify that a substantial protective buffer zone to Canvey Wick SSSI will be applied, within which there would be no new residential	No				The RSPB is greatly concerned about the plans in Policy C4 for a broad location next to Canvey Wick SSSI and near West Canvey Marsh RSPB reserve, especially the 2000 homes. Canvey Wick SSSI is nationally important for invertebrates, and important for species such as Nightingale, and therefore a source of pride for Castle Point. There is great responsibility for its appropriate treatment. We urge that any new housing be located at the eastern end of the broad location, well away from the vulnerable wildlife, and with business or industrial units separating new residential buildings from the SSSI. There should be no added lighting, pollution, and disturbance impacts. To avoid harm to the SSSI and West Canvey Marsh RSPB reserve, please clarify Policy C4 as	Concerns mostly accepted. Mods to policy proposed	9- ~~Appropri~~ ~~ate links~~ ~~into~~ ~~multi-~~ ~~function~~ ~~at green~~ ~~infrastru~~ ~~cture to~~ ~~the west~~ ~~of the~~ ~~site~~ ~~whilst~~ ~~avoiding~~ ~~adverse~~ ~~harm to~~ ~~biodiver~~ ~~sity~~ ~~through~~ ~~recreatio~~ ~~nat~~ ~~impacts,~~ ~~or other~~ ~~impacts~~ ~~arising~~ ~~from~~ ~~urban~~ ~~develop~~ ~~ment.~~ 9) A strategy that minimis es impacts upon the SSSI and does not impede LNRS aims of connect ivity; via

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
											location, should therefore be implemented, and alternative green space for dog walking provided, but these are not yet specified in this Policy. Many recreational impacts, such as predation by domestic cats, will be lessened if the surrounding area to the SSSI is business or industrial units rather than residential (any new residential units should be situated towards the eastern end of the broad location), but this must be clarified in Policy and there must still be a careful approach. We strongly urge a substantial protective buffer zone to Canvey Wick SSSI, within which there would be no new residential development, ideally of 400m or more. This is partly to protect vulnerable, ground-nesting Nightingales, an LNRS Priority Species, which have an important population at the SSSI. Nightingales are a Red-listed species of conservation concern due to substantial declines in their national population of about 90% over the past 50 years. The national census, carried out in 2012 and 2013, revealed that fewer than 5500 singing males remain in the UK. Nightingales nest on or near the	development, ideally of 400m or more to reduce impacts from recreation and pets; 3) Clarify that any new development within the buffer zone and closer to the SSSI will be business or industrial units, and that these will not add pressures to the SSSI nor impede LNRS aims of connectivity; 4) Remove the "provide recreation" from Paragraph 8.39; 5) Specify that any new residential units will not encourage direct access onto the SSSI area; 6) Specify provision of well-designed alternative green space or park for dog walking, away from the SSSI, to help alleviate pressure on the designated site and surrounds; 7) Ensure implications of lighting and noise are fully mitigated for any new developments near to the SSSI and West Canvey Marsh to avoid causing harm, such as to the invertebrate features of the SSSI, as well as to bats. Low or zero lighting, timer use, sensors, and other measures, need to be applied on or around sites of high invertebrate/nature value, as there is considerable scientific evidence around the impact of artificial lighting on invertebrates. 8) Any development in this						follows: 1) Clarify that any new residential units (2000 homes) will be allocated to the eastern end of the broad location zone, well away from the SSSI and surrounding area, ideally outside a buffer zone of 400m; 2 Clarify that a substantial protective buffer zone to Canvey Wick SSSI will be applied, within which there would be no new residential development, ideally of 400m or more to reduce impacts from recreation and pets; 3) Clarify that any new development within the buffer zone and closer to the SSSI will be business or industrial units, and that these will not add pressures to the SSSI nor impede LNRS aims of connectivity; 4) Remove the "provide recreation" from Paragraph 8.39; 5) Specify that any new residential			sensitive consideration of siting, buffers, lighting and noise. Residential development should be located with suitable buffers and in less sensitive parts of the site to avoid adverse impacts 10) Enhance ments that complement the designated features and features of interest of Canvey Wick SSSI.

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											ground, therefore their eggs and young are at higher risk from ground predators and accordingly vulnerable to the man-made pressures of recreational disturbance and urbanisation effects. If housing is placed too close to the SSSI, long-term urbanisation impacts could arise, including disturbance from noise and artificial lighting, recreational disturbance and the serious pressure of predation by domestic cats that would arise from new residential development near the site. Experience from similar sites, such as the protection of important populations of heathland birds from the indirect effects of urban development in southern England, indicates that it is not usually possible to mitigate the acute impacts on vulnerable ground-nesting birds from housing located in close proximity to the protected sites. Based on our understanding of the available scientific evidence of cat roaming distances this can range from 360m to 2.4km, with fences and hedges presenting little obstacle to this. We consider that 400m would be an appropriate buffer for the SSSI to any new residential units; the	area should include enhancements that complement the designated features and features of interest of Canvey Wick SSSI. For example, any redevelopment of the adjacent area should factor in features that we will support increased biodiversity, in particular scarce and rare invertebrates. This can be done by including brownfield habitat within the development; green roofs, sandy planted areas/sandbanks, and use of waste material such as crushed concrete in gabion baskets, are all examples of this. 9) Development should also not impact on RSPB West Canvey Marsh; through water quality impacts, recreational disturbance, and habitat degradation. This is partly covered in the plan in Section 8.40: 'The nature conservation sites at west Canvey are however sensitive to recreational activities and urban development so it is important that the Master Plan deals with this in an appropriate manner'. This caution should be emphasised and enacted through precautionary measures such as those raised for Canvey Wick.					units will not encourage direct access onto the SSSI area; 6) Specify provision of well-designed alternative green space or park for dog walking, away from the SSSI, to help alleviate pressure on the designated site and surrounds; 7) Ensure implications of lighting and noise are fully mitigated for any new developments near to the SSSI and West Canvey Marsh to avoid causing harm, such as to the invertebrate features of the SSSI, as well as to bats. Low or zero lighting, timer use, sensors, and other measures, need to be applied on or around sites of high invertebrate/nature value, as there is considerable scientific evidence around the impact of artificial lighting on invertebrates. 8) Any development in this area should include enhancements that		Redevelopment of the adjacent area should factor in features that we will support increased biodiversity, in particular scarce and rare invertebrates, via measures such as green roofs, brownfield habitat, sandy planted areas/sandbanks and use of waste material such as crushed concrete in gabion baskets. 10) Well-designe

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
											evidence suggests that this would avoid most cats entering the SSSI, in addition to reducing the effects of other disturbance to breeding Nightingales and other species as a result of human recreational impacts. Given the above comments, in the absence of written clarity in Policy C4, aspects of this Policy may not comply with: the Essex LNRS aims for Priority Species and enhancement and connecting Areas of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (APIB); the tests and robust policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in relation to developments in proximity to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs); and Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 on the duty of Councils to conserve and enhance biodiversity. In addition, Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states: “Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by a) “protecting and enhancing...sites of biodiversity” and; d) “minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent								complement the designated features and features of interest of Canvey Wick SSSI. For example, any redevelopment of the adjacent area should factor in features that we will support increased biodiversity, in particular scarce and rare invertebrates. This can be done by including brownfield habitat within the development; green roofs, sandy planted areas/sandbanks, and use of waste material such as crushed concrete in gabion baskets, are all examples of this. 9) Development should also not impact on RSPB West Canvey Marsh; through water quality impacts, recreational disturbance, and habitat degradation. This is partly covered in the plan in Section 8.40: 'The nature conservation sites at west Canvey are however sensitive to recreational activities and urban development so it is		d alternative green space or park for dog walking, away from the SSSI, to help alleviate pressure on the designated site and surrounds;

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.” As it stands Policy C4 may be placing Canvey Wick SSSI, its designated features and other key wildlife of national importance, at increased risk.						important that the Master Plan deals with this in an appropriate manner'. This caution should be emphasised and enacted through precautionary measures such as those raised for Canvey Wick.		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 0 1 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Viv	Bygr ave		Yes	C4	Yes	This is a guarded 'yes' as I can only assume Castlepoint Council act in a lawful manner at all times as I have elected them to have this specific knowledge and expertise	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	It should meet the needs of the area, it does not meet the needs of the residents current and future of Canvey island. Who would want to live on Canvey Island when the traffic system is insufficient to allow exit from the island especially at rush hour and times of emergency when traffic is at a standstill maybe for 2 or 3 hours. People need more affordable housing off the island to reduce the substantial pressure on all the services currently available on Canvey which do not meet the needs of many current residents not to mention another over 3000 homes. There is one access/exit roundabout through which ALL traffic must travel to leave or enter the island that cannot cope well at many times of the day for the existing approx 45 000 residents , it can t cope with more traffic. It is a frequent occurrence that the roads are blocked in a gridlock which sometimes reaches far back through the town centre, this may be a simple accident or broken down vehicle as the main roads are single tracked . Even an accident on the A130 or as far away as the Dartford tunnel can cause a standstill of many hours on Canvey and reduce safety on the island. there here have been serious disasters such as the	1. To increase the density of homes on Canvey it is crucial to improve infrastructure by upgrading the sewage and rainwater collection systems currently uses 3 inch (not standard 6 inch pipes0 so so it can genuinely cope with the needs of residents on the island . New housing increases a system already under severe strain because the new developments use the larger pipes which have greater flow which then feed into the narrow pipes and create blockages and other problems. Recently where I live two roads have been closed for many weeks where the road collapsed and the sewer had to be rebuilt and then the road restored. 2. Especially with proposals at C4 another exit MUST be provided off the Island, extending and connecting to Stanford Le Hope/Corringham at junction with Thames Gateway and thus to A13 using the part built emergency route at Charfleets past the new cemetery would be an appropriate solution. 3. To fully consider the needs of the proposed homes and the residents . The plan says infrastructure ahs been considered but no details are specified and thus it is unsound. Canvey residents are fed up 'being done to' . We ve fought long and hard for years -	Not Answered	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Gas hazards Emergency services Green/Grey Belt Flood risk on canvey Infrastructure Third road onto Canvey	Gas Hazards As set out in Plan paragraph 8.28 'Both port facilities are registered as Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) sites due to the hazardous nature of the goods that they receive and store. The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and the Environment Agency are responsible for regulating activities at these sites, and also provide advice on the level of hazard the installations pose to nearby development. Both installations have HSE consultation zones identified around them, in which it is expected that other	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d					
											aviation fuel tanker that caught fire at Sadlers farm and mains water bursts at Tarpots that stopped traffic flow for several days on the island. The new retail development at Charfleets has attracted more traffic to the Island sometimes it is difficult to access the roundabout from Waterside as the oncoming traffic has right of way. Building 2000 homes - a huge development- with potentially another 4000 cars will dramatically affect the viability of the Waterside roundabout and further impede the traffic trying to exit the Island From Somnes Ave. There is no provision for the numerous childcare places that will be needed. Currently childcare is being offered in converted shops and offices with little or no space for the children to have outdoor play which is crucial to their learning because of the lack of available land for good quality childcare facilities. There is NO GREEN BELT on Canvey apart from the RSPB sanctuary. The land is already dense with closely built housing with tiny gardens in many instances, outdoor play spaces and leisure areas are already limited and totally inadequate for so much more housing. You can t create leisure spaces when	against the methane gas storage and the 'creeping gas underground' which persists, the oil and now Calor gas and Aviation fuel, with inadequate overloaded roads so that in an emergency not only is it impossible to get off the island in a timely manner but Emergency services cannot easily access or exit the Island causing further risk to life.											development is controlled to limit unnecessary harm to life and property. The extent of these zones is determined by the nature of the goods received and stored on site, and the technical measures employed to ensure safety at the sites. It is therefore possible that the level of hazard posed to other developments nearby can be reduced, both by limiting development nearby, and also by seeking improvements to the level of hazard posed by these sites, both during normal management and maintenance, and also at the point where new development	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											the Island is covered with housing. Whereas off the Island Hadleigh and Benfleet have the luxury of far more green spaces and parks and sport etc so some of their green/grey belt could be used for housing to alleviate the problems of living on Canvey, not exacerbate them. We have no woods on Canvey, maybe Benfleet could do with one less and houses could be built there instead of 2000 crammed into an area prone to flooding and a such a short distance from major industrial dangers such as Calor gas storage and aviation storage and distribution on the limited and busy 'highways'. with a mere retained fire service in case of emergency								is proposed.’ The current HSE consultation zones are indicated on the policies map. The plan doesn’t propose any new housing allocations in the HSE consultation zone. However, some existing residential areas are already within the zone, as well as the Thorney Bay Park Homes site. Policy SD8 ‘Development near Hazardous Uses’ states that ‘Development proposals will be assessed in accordance with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Guidance where they fall within a	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consultation zone for one or more hazardous installations. Where the HSE advises against development the planning application will be refused on health and safety grounds’. Emergency services Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Flood Risk on Canvey Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		substantially defended from flooding. The recommendations of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment do not seek to restrict the overall level of development in the borough, including on Canvey, but aim to direct the location of development and/or the design of development to minimise exposure to flood risk. Furthermore, flooding and the need for flood management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4, SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the plan, and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. Third Road	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		onto Canvey The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. Access improvements for Canvey are a strategic matter which cannot be addressed through the Castle Point Plan alone, as any growth is only a proportion of the demand for those access improvements . The bulk of the demand come from the existing 16,000 households on Canvey. However, the strategic need for access improvements to Canvey Island have been identified	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex specifically identifies three projects which will improve accessibility to and from the Island. The Local Transport Plan sits alongside the Castle Point Plan, and the development in the Castle Point Plan will make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
1023-0001	Individual	sean	quarternsnr.		Yes	C4	No	i only heard about this through my son everyone should have been contacted.	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	how can it be fair to put thousands of houses on canvey we dont have the infrastrucutre to cope. what about the schools, doctors and roads?? canvey is the wrong place to build this many houses its wrong and we all know you wont build any new roads to make it worse its awful getting off canvey in the morning already you should build new towns in north essex instead	dont build that much on canvey its not fair on us why should we take all of benfleets housing needs. build them somewhere that has proper access to roads. and why build it all around charfleets we need jobs on canvey too.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	no building on canvey concern for loss of jobs on charfleets	Comments noted Loss of jobs on charfleets Policy C4 includes a 10% increase on commercial floorspace and does not encourage the loss of jobs	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											or if not build it next to the motorway not canvey.								
1 0 2 5 - 0 0 0 9	Individual	Ma rtin	Engl and		Yes	C4	No	The draft plan is not legally compliant as it fails to consider strategic alternatives, like North West Thundersley, which has been excluded, the Biodiversity and environmental protection needs strengthening, there is no credible five-year housing land supply and a lack of evidence on cross-boundary infrastructure with a duty to cooperate. The policy of not building on the Greenbelt is biased and predetermined.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Add the Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites of Kings Park HO31. Add the Greenbelt site of Land East of Manor Trading S0145 SHLAA 2018. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Benfleet at 347, Thundersley at 643, and Hadleigh at 305, keeping Existing Commitments 480, and Windfall Allowance 675. Total housing target of 11,000. Remove Charfleets Industrial Estate site from the plan.	Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	Objects to C4 because: impact on buisnesses shouldn't have housing on this site	Businesses in operation The purpose of policy C4 is not to remove employment opportunities from the borough, it is a way to bring investment and regeneration to an area of which the urban environment could be improved. The allocation specifies a requirement of at least 10% increase in industrial and commercial building floor space.It does not intent for the loss of jobs, buisnesses or buisness commercial spaces. The purpose of this allocation is not to relocate any businessess.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											Island’s unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. The inclusion of the Charfleets Industrial estate as a brownfield site for development into a mixed use housing and industrial area has not fully considered the impact on micro, small, medium and large businesses currently operating on the estate that are currently renting property or own their own site, there is no assessment of how they will be able to operationally or financially continue to operate, should													Housing suitability Policy C4 requires a masterplan to ensure that the location of housing within the site is suitable and ensures that residential amenity is not impacted.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											they be forced to move to new premises or have restrictions placed on their existing operations in the future, due to the proximity of new residential properties. This policy is not evidence based, as I believe there has been poor engagement verging on negligent engagement, and officers have not engaged with the majority on the businesses on the Charfleets Industrial estate. The future plans for Charfleets Industrial estate needs a fully supported, full economic regeneration of the estate, and there is no reasoned justification for using the Charfleets Industrial estate for housing, with business integrated with residential homes.								
1081-0002	Individual	Daniel	Sullivan		Yes	C4	No	This process for objection and the very long document and form for objection is too unwieldy for the average person. You are not enabling your population to be able to voice their opinions and objections easily. This approach lacks accessibility and isn't inclusive.	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	4. Loss of Employment Land The proposed development in the Charfleets area threatens to displace local businesses and reduce employment opportunities. This land is currently designated for employment use and plays a vital role in supporting the local economy. Replacing it with housing undermines long-term economic sustainability.		No	Not Answered	Yes		Objecting to C4 due to loss of jobs and employment space on charfleets	Policy C4 includes an increase of 10% commercial floorspace and will not result in the loss of commercial space.	N
1103-0	Not Answered	Victoria	Sullivan		Not Answered	C4	No	I understand that a consultation has to be robust and relevant evidence and documentation provided, but the 230 page	No	Positively prepared	5. Loss of Employment Land The Charfleets area, earmarked for housing, is currently designated for employment. Replacing this with residential		No	Not Answered			Policy C4: Concerned about loss of jobs	Policy C4 includes an overall increase in industrial floor space of 10%	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 2								document, and overly complicated form (this form) are too complex for the average person, this includes the fact that you are asking people to reference different parts of the consultation document. I think this is a construct to make it too difficult so people do not bother to object. How is the average person to know if the consultation is sound or legally compliant?			development risks the loss of local jobs and undermines the economic sustainability of the island.							and therefore will not result in a loss of employment	
1 1 0 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mr	Sam mon s			C4	No	Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	No	Not Stated						A	Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 0 7 - 0 0 0 3	Sue	Jac kso n				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at Canvey west impacts emergency evacuation procedures for residents at Canvey East	Castle Points resident's safety is a priority to the Council and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 0 8 - 0 0	Vickey	Sta rke y				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1109-0003	Robert	Martin				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1110-0003	Andrew	Elliot				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1111-0003	Philip	Moran				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1112-0003	Steven	Hutton				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
111	Maureen	Martin				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk						Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 - 0 0 0 3											with emergency evacuation procedures.						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 1 1 4 - 0 0 0 3	Pauline	Jon es				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 1 5 - 0 0 0 3	Derek	Wa rre n				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 1 6 - 0 0 0 3	Sharon	Mor an				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 1 7 - 0	Edward	Ed war ds				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 1 1 8 - 0 0 0 3	Robert	Jon es				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 1 9 - 0 0 0 3	William	Sho tto n				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 2 0 - 0 0 0 3	Barbara	Har me r				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 2 1 - 0 0 0 3	Margaret	Bre nna n				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 2 2 - 0 0 0 3	Rosemary	Gri ms ey				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 2 3 - 0 0 0 3	Ian	Gri ms ey				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 2 4 - 0 0 0 3	Joyce	San der s				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 2 5 - 0 0 0 3	Graham	San der s				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 2 6	Brenda	Tan ner				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 3																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 1 2 7 - 0 0 0 3	John	Tan ner				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 2 8 - 0 0 0 3	Christine	Tug gey				C4					Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 2 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Sim one	Cald eco urt			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 3 0 - 0 0	Individual	Pat	Moo re			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1131-0003	Individual	Iris	Staley			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1132-0003	Individual	Carol	Simmons			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1133-0003	Individual	Ken	Childs			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1134-0003	Individual	Jan	Childs			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
11	Individual	Jan	Sinclair			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the						Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
3 5 - 0 0 0 3											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 1 3 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ang ela	Rigg s			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 3 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ed war d	How ard			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 3 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mar ion	Davi es			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 3 9 - 0	Individual	Ken net h	Gree n			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 1 4 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ric har d	Ivory			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 4 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ang ela	Ivory			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 4 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ala n	Dyer			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 4 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ang ela	Rea ding			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 4 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	She ila	Durr anc e			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 4 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ro ber t	Spic er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 4 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	She ila	Spic er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 4 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Pat rici a	Belc her			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 4 8	Individual	Bre nda	Gor ham			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
-0003																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1149-0003	Individual	Barbara	Montgomery			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1150-0003	Individual	Ron	Rowe			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1151-0003	Individual	Jan	Rowe			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1152-000	Individual	Jannette	Green			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1153-0003	Individual	Joan	McGilligan			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1154-0003	Individual	Roger	Webber			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1155-0003	Individual	Sylvia	Hobday			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1156-0003	Individual	Robert	Herd			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 5 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Eliz abe th	Hear d			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 5 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Cor inn e	You ng			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 5 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mar y	Robi nso n			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 6 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jea n	Star buc k			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 6 1	Individual	Jea n	Rae side			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 3																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 1 6 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ma ure en	Dem erin g			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 6 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Dav id	Eve			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 6 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Sa ma nth a	Ball			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 6 5 - 0 0	Individual	Jac que line	Mos edal e			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1166-0003	Individual	Irene	Mitchell			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1167-0003	Individual	Peter	Davis			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1168-0003	Individual	Eileen	Davis			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1169-0003	Individual	Helena	Wright			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1170003	Individual	Derek	Champion			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1171003	Individual	Harry	Page			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1172003	Individual	Sylvia	Page			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1173003	Individual	Lilian	Eniffer			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1174	Individual	Linda	Carrall			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
-0003																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1175-0003	Individual	Andy	Carr oll			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1176-0003	Individual	Rus sell	Aubi n			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1177-0003	Individual	Car ole	Aubi n			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1178-000	Individual	Ken net h	Hall			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1179-0003	Individual	Patricia	Cantwell			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1180-0003	Individual	Bernard	Lewin			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1181-0003	Individual	Michael	Hillman			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1182-0003	Individual	Clive	Schooling			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
11	Individual	Victor	Whe lan			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the						Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
8 3 - 0 0 0 3											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 1 8 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jean ette	Size r			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 8 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Juli e	Tith erad ge			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 8 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mr B	Hod gson			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 8 7 - 0	Individual	Mrs B	Hod gson			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 1 8 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Pauline	Oddy			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 8 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Janet	Burton			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 9 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Carol	Charles			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 9 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Melvyn	Jarvis			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 9 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	San dra	Jarvi s			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 9 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Dav id	Cant y			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 9 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ste phe n	Edg ewo rth			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 9 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Bar bar a	Wat ers			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 1 9 6	Individual	Nor ma n	Neil d			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
-0003																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1197-0003	Individual	Jill	Watts			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1198-0003	Individual	Malcolm	Dyer			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1199-0003	Individual	Roger	Laker			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1200-000	Individual	Edward	Childs			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
12001-0003	Individual	David	Jones			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
12002-0003	Individual	John	Mogford			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
12003-0003	Individual	Barbara	Radley			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
12004-0003	Individual	Daphne	McQuade			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
12	Individual	David	White			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the						Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
05-0003											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1206-0003	Individual	Brian	Norman			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1207-0003	Individual	Mary	Drummond			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1208-0003	Individual	Chris	Silvester			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1209-000	Individual	Christine	Lockwood			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 1 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mar k	Lock woo d			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 1 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	He ath er	Sha ckle ton			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 1 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Kar en	Lang wort h			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 1 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	An ne	Rou d			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1214-0003	Individual	Margaret	White			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1215-0003	Individual	Kenneth	Carter			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1216-0003	Individual	Dorothy	Carter			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1217-0003	Individual	Eunice	Sawyer			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1218	Individual	Matthew	Lindsay			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 3																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 1 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Susan	Lindsay			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 2 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Janet	Norman			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 2 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Kenneth	Sheilds			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 2 2 - 0 0	Individual	Susan	Webb			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3																		Castle Point Plan	
1 2 2 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ma ggi e	Web b			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 2 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Dal e	Gow ler			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 2 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ken	Hear d			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 2 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Car ol	Hear d			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2	Individual	Terr y	Caw s			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the						Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
2 7 - 0 0 0 3											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 2 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ray mo nd	Bak er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 2 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mr A	Oliv er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 3 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mrs P	Oliv er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 3 1 - 0	Individual	Jac que line	Hou nso me			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 3 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Sus an	Ree d			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 3 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Da niel	Davi es			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 3 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ja me s	Mon tgo mer y			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 3 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Chr isti ne	Pay ne			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1236-0003	Individual	Barbara	Hedges			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1237-0003	Individual	John	Potts			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1238-0003	Individual	Sue	Cameron			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1239-0003	Individual	Steve	Clifford			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1240	Individual	Angela	Harris			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 3																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 4 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Terr y	Hill			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 4 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Rob ert	Haw kins			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 4 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mr K	Cha ndle r			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 4 4 - 0 0	Individual	De n	Cha ndle r			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1245-0003	Individual	Thomas	Newton			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1246-0003	Individual	Michael	Rogers			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1247-0003	Individual	Colin	Bywater			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1248-0003	Individual	Steve	Ellis			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
12	Individual	Jill	Ellis			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the						Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
4 9 - 0 0 0 3											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 5 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Col in	ODo nova n			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 5 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Phil om ena	Odo nova n			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 5 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ana sta sia	Pow er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 5 3 - 0	Individual	Bri an	Tho mas			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 5 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ed win a	Ford			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evaculation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 5 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Lin da	Clay don			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evaculation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 5 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Pa mel a	Warr en			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evaculation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 5 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Joh n	Hill			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evaculation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1258-0003	Individual	Susan	Laurie			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1259-0003	Individual	Eric	Burnham			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1260-0003	Individual	Janice	Dawkins			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1261-0003	Individual	Jean	Hagger			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1262	Individual	Patricia	Ruff			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 3																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 6 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mar ilyn	Helli car			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 6 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jac kie	Bro wn			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 6 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Pet er	Hosi er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 6 6 - 0 0	Individual	Pau l	Scot t			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3																		Castle Point Plan	
1 2 6 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Gw end a	Gatr ell			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 6 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jun e	Hoo per			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 6 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ter esa	Barv ick			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 7 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Tho mas	McC lena gha n			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2	Individual	Nor ma	Reis			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the						Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
7 1 - 0 0 0 3											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 7 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ste ven	Low e			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 7 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ant hon y	Smit h			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 7 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	The res a	Gra nt			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 7 5 - 0	Individual	Kim	Raw ling			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 7 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Rog er	Sain s			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 7 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Linda	Teb b			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 7 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Pet er	Ree d			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 7 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Alan	Pric e			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1280003	Individual	Lesley	Taylor			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1281003	Individual	Jean	Davies			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1282003	Individual	Barbara	Letch			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1283003	Individual	Dawn	Young			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
12844	Individual	Raymond	O'Callaghan			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
-0003																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1285-0003	Individual	Joan	OCallaghan			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1286-0003	Individual	John	Hammond			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1287-0003	Individual	Mr AJ	Taylor			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1288-000	Individual	Mrs AJ	Taylor			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1289-0003	Individual	Anita	Shean			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1290-0003	Individual	John	Shean			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1291-0003	Individual	Albert	Leatham			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1292-0003	Individual	Stephen	Fox			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
12	Individual	Sylvia	Fox			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the						Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
9 3 - 0 0 0 3											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 9 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Linda	Freeman			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 9 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	James	Gray			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 9 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Anthony	Johnson			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 9 7 - 0	Individual	PATRICK	GARDNER			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 2 9 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Joan	McCulloch			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 2 9 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Eileen	Jane			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 0 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Susan	Bass			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 0 0 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Christine	Eagles			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1302-0003	Individual	June	Marterson			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1303-0003	Individual	Brian	Marterson			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1308-0003	Individual	Michael	Ford		Yes	C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1309-0002	Individual	Kay	Pumfrey			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1310	Individual	L	West			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
-0003																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1311-0003	Individual	Dorothy	Panter			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1312-0003	Individual	Vickey	Starkey			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1313-0003	Individual	Alan	West			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1314-000	Individual	Graham	Titheradge			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1315-0003	Individual	Mrs J	Titheradge			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1316-0003	Individual	Valerie	Hawkins			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1317-0003	Individual	John	Hawkins			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1318-0003	Individual	Leonora	Mallake			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
13	Individual	Janet	Almond			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the		No				Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 9 - 0 0 0 3											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 3 2 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	M	Glover			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 2 2 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	J	Glover			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 2 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Reg	Baker			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 2 3 - 0	Individual	Christine	Bentham			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 3 2 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Irene	Sambrook			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 2 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Julie	Hicks			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 2 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Brian	Hicks			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 2 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Sharon	Porter			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 2 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	She lley	Hull			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 2 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Terr y	Wild man			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 3 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Bre nda	Tan ner			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 3 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mrs L	Coyt e			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 3 2	Individual	S	Byrn e			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
-0003																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1333-0003	Individual	S	Clarke			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1334-0003	Individual	Pam	Malley			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1335-0003	Individual	Jame	Willis			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1336-000	Individual	Julie	Hutton			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1337-0003	Individual	Joy ce	Dou ghty			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1338-0003	Individual	Ste ve	Hutt on			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1339-0003	Individual	Jan et	Mitc hell			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1340-0003	Individual	Ivy	Fish er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
13	Individual	D	Huc kle			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the		No				Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
4 1 - 0 0 0 3											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 3 4 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Lar ry	Coyt e			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 4 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ber yl	Ste wart			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 4 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Tra cy	Dufo sse			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 4 5 - 0	Individual	Linda	Cooper			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 3 4 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Chr isto phe r	Mur phy			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 4 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mar ie	Step hen son			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 4 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	J	Milt on			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 4 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	D	Tugg ey			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 5 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Joy	Bak er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 5 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	J	Mal pass			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 5 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mrs VM	Alle n			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 5 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jun e	Mox hay			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 5 4	Individual	Mar tin	Engli sh			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 3																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 3 5 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Dor een	Hun nabl e			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 5 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Juli e	Cas hma n			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 5 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ian	Gri mse y			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 5 8 - 0 0	Individual	Linda	Conl on			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1359-0003	Individual	Francis	Hammond			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1360-0003	Individual	Jean	Cole			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1361-0003	Individual	S	Rabey			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1362-0003	Individual	Christine	Le-May			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
13	Individual	Linda	Godley			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the		No				Development at West Canvey will	The safety of all Castle	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
6 3 - 0 0 0 3											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures						impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 3 6 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Wen dy	Edw ards			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 6 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jan e	Gri mm er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 6 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Nor ma n	War n			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 6 7 - 0	Individual	Pat rici a	Care swel l			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 3																	those residents living at East Canvey	considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1 3 6 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Steven	Tilley			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 6 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Terry	Wood			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 7 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Susan	Tilley			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 7 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Barbara	Harmer			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 7 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ma ure en	Vale			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 7 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Pat rici a	Bak er			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 7 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mo nic a	Clar k			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 7 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ros em ary	Gri mse y			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1 3 7 6	Individual	Jan et	Dina line			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
-0003																	procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	
1377-0003	Individual	Sharon	Moran			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1378-0003	Individual	Philip	Moran			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1379-0003	Individual	Ann	Eldridge			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1380-000	Individual	Mrs V	Norris			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
03																		Castle Point Plan	
1381-0003	Individual	Mrs F	Pacham			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1382-0003	Individual	John	Tanner			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1383-0003	Individual	Janet	Baker			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1384-0003	Individual	S	Dillon			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
14	Individual	Sheila	Clifford		Yes	C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the						The number of Canvey West homes	Needs of emergency	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
24-0002											East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures						puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0059-0001	Individual	Steve	McGregor		Not Stated	C5	Not Stated	A restricted tunnel for cars, pedestrians and cyclists would not only provide a needed 3rd access but also open up employment opportunities in Thurrock to Canvey residents. This could also contribute to the soundness of policy C4. The Thames enterprise park would be 2.3 miles, 10-15 minutes bike ride away. A smaller tunnel would be quicker and cheaper to construct with precast sections as an example that will minimise length of time work is undertaken in the SSSI. Once completed the marsh can be reinstated with no need for mitigation. Kind regards Steve	Not Stated				Not Stated		Yes additional information regarding access plans off Canvey	A	Policy C5 A restricted tunnel for cars, pedestrians and cyclists would not only provide a needed 3rd access but also open up employment opportunities in Thurrock to Canvey residents. This could also contribute to the soundness of policy C4. The Thames enterprise park would be 2.3 miles, 10-15 minutes bike ride away. A smaller tunnel would be quicker and cheaper to construct with precast sections as an example that will minimise length of time work is undertaken in the SSSI. Once completed the marsh can be reinstated with no need for mitigation.	Comments noted. Submission papers saved to internal folder 'Canvey Access Feasibility Study (Forthcoming)' for further consideration as part of the future project.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0823-0007	Organisation	Pat	Abbott	Environment Agency	Yes	C5	Yes		Yes		We support the Council's undertaking to carry out a feasibility study to look at options for improving access to, from and within Canvey Island. This would provide useful additional infrastructure to help facilitate evacuation in the event of forecast tidal flooding as well as providing improvements in day-to-day peak hour traffic congestion. We would strongly recommend that the Essex Resilience Forum are included in the scoping and undertaking of the feasibility study (in their multi-Agency Emergency Planning role) along with Essex County Council in their Highways and Transportation Authority role and perhaps this should be reflected in the text of paragraph 8.50.	We support the Council's undertaking to carry out a feasibility study to look at options for improving access to, from and within Canvey Island. This would provide useful additional infrastructure to help facilitate evacuation in the event of forecast tidal flooding as well as providing improvements in day-to-day peak hour traffic congestion. We would strongly recommend that the Essex Resilience Forum are included in the scoping and undertaking of the feasibility study (in their multi-Agency Emergency Planning role) along with Essex County Council in their Highways and Transportation Authority role and perhaps this should be reflected in the text of paragraph 8.50.	No	Not Answered		A	Support for policy C5 and suggestion for the inclusion of the reference to the Essex Resilience Forum in the supporting text at paragraph 8.50	Support noted, see proposed modifications	8.50 ECC as Highway and Transportation Authority will be required to be directly involved in the scoping and undertaking of any feasibility study. The Essex Resilience Forum (in their multi-Agency Emergency Planning role) should also be included in the scoping and undertaking of the feasibility study.

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0282-0011	Organisation	Kevin	Frasier	Essex County Council	Yes	C5	Not Stated		Yes		ECC welcome reference in Criteria 2 and paragraph 8.50 to ECC, as Highway and Transportation Authority, being required to be directly involved in the scoping and undertaking of any feasibility study regarding improved access to and around Canvey Island. ECC is currently consulting on a new Local Transport Plan - 'A Better Connected Essex'. The South Essex Implementation Plan Appendix A identifies ideas of projects at a snapshot in time but which have not been subject to feasibility or have any funding. Relevant scheme ideas include: • Canvey Access Improvement to enhance connectivity to and from the island by all modes of transport to improve sustainable access and ease traffic congestion. This would improve access to services, health and wellbeing, and access to employment. • Improved links from Canvey to Thames Freeport to improve access between Canvey Island and Thames Freeport to connect people to jobs and address high levels of deprivation. This would improve access to services, health and wellbeing, and access to employment. • Castle Point walking and	ECC welcome reference to ECC being a potential partner in any future feasibility project to improve access to Canvey Island as this is consistent with the emerging LTP4 and South Essex Implementation Plan.	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	EEC welcomes its proposed involvement in any future Canvey Island improved access feasibility study. The emerging Local Transport Plan includes scheme ideas for improving access to Canvey Island, have not been subject to feasibility or have any funding.	Noted:	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											cycling improvements (LCWIP) - Route Number 10 - Connects Canvey Town Centre to Benfleet Station utilising the bridge at Canvey Road, Somnes Avenue, Central Wall Road and Knightswick Road.								
0336-0008	Organisation	Caroline	Peters	Essex Police		C5	Not Stated	The DOCO notes the requirement to improve access to, from and within Canvey Island. It is essential that emergency vehicles can gain rapid access to any incident occurring across Canvey Island and surrounding neighbourhoods. It is recommended that there is liaison with the Essex Road Policing Team who can support the design process when considering future road infrastructure.	Not Stated							A	It is essential that emergency vehicles can gain rapid access to any incident occurring across Canvey Island and surrounding neighbourhoods. It is recommended that there is liaison with the Essex Road Policing Team who can support the design process when considering future road infrastructure.	Any changes to access will be subject to consultation from Essex highways.	N
1106-0002	Organisation	Diana	Nagobi	National Highways		C5	Not Stated		Not Stated	Not Stated	Whilst it is unlikely that the development would generate significant new trips on the A13 and M25, we note that Policy C5 is focused on improving access to and around Canvey Island. It is acknowledged that the A13 and A130 are key access points into Canvey Island and that the junctions and a feasibility study will be carried out to identify their options for improving access to, from and within Canvey Island, including its wider strategic implications. Some key collaboration partners					B - see 1106-003 and 1106-004	We note that Policy C5 is focused on improving access to and around Canvey Island. It is acknowledged that the A13 and A130 are key access points into Canvey Island and that the junctions and a feasibility study will be carried out to identify their options for improving access to, from and within Canvey Island, including its wider	Noted.Although Government Departments are mentioned in C5(2) it is agreed that National Highways warrants specific mention. Clarifying mod proposed to Policy C5 '2. This will be prepared in collaboration with key partners	Y

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											are identified although National Highways is not mentioned specifically. Within paragraph 2.1 our Memorandum of Understanding, Castle Point state their intention to engage with us in the study, to include the preparation of the brief with the aim of ensuring that any areas of concerns raised by National Highways are explored within the study. We agreed that that the exception to a requirement for a Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) will be when a new access road to Canvey Island comes forward and an STA will be required at that stage to assess the impacts that a new access to Canvey Island would have on the SRN. We ask that National Highways are engaged and included in any future consideration of a new access to Canvey Island. We look forward to continued engagement with Castle Point Borough Council as the transport evidence base for the Local Plan is developed and would expect the transport assessment for the Local Plan to identify if there is any potential for impact on the SRN and associated need for mitigation measures. We also look forward to being consulted on any planning applications that have the potential to impact the SRN in the future.							strategic implications. Some key collaboration partners are identified although National Highways is not mentioned specifically. Within paragraph 2.1 our Memorandum of Understanding, Castle Point state their intention to engage with us in the study, to include the preparation of the brief with the aim of ensuring that any areas of concerns raised by National Highways are explored within the study. We agreed that that the exception to a requirement for a Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) will be when a new access road to Canvey Island comes forward and an STA will be required at that stage to assess the impacts that a new access to Canvey Island would have on the SRN. We ask that National Highways are engaged and included in any future consideration of a new access to	including ECC, adjoining district and unitary councils, Transport East, National Highways , Government departments such as the DfT, BEIS and MHCLG and relevant agencies as well as engagement with the local community.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	Canvey Island. We look forward to continued engagement with Castle Point Borough Council as the transport evidence base for the Local Plan is developed and would expect the transport assessment for the Local Plan to identify if there is any potential for impact on the SRN and associated need for mitigation measures. We also look forward to being consulted on any planning applications that have the potential to impact the SRN in the future.		
1 1 0 6 - 0 0 0 4	Organisati on	Dia na	Nag obi	Nati onal High way s		C5	Not Sta ted		No t Sta ted	Not Stated	We have reviewed the CPP 2026-2043 Regulation 19 Draft, dated July 2025, which focuses on the site allocations and key policies for the CPP area over the period of 2026 to 2043. We note that Policy C5 is focused on improving access to and around Canvey Island. The policy states that a feasibility study will be carried out to identify options for improving access to, from and within Canvey Island, including its wider strategic implications. In the future, should a proposal					Non e	We have reviewed the CPP 2026-2043 Regulation 19 Draft, dated July 2025, which focuses on the site allocations and key policies for the CPP area over the period of 2026 to 2043. We note that Policy C5 is focused on improving access to and around Canvey Island. The policy states that a feasibility study will be carried out to	Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											come forward to provide improved transport links from Canvey Island to the A130 / A13, we ask that National Highways are included in those discussions and consulted throughout the process.						identify options for improving access to, from and within Canvey Island, including its wider strategic implications. In the future, should a proposal come forward to provide improved transport links from Canvey Island to the A130 / A13, we ask that National Highways are included in those discussions and consulted throughout the process.		
0 6 2 6 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Sha ron	Onei ll		Yes	C5	No	How can more building be put on sites in Town centre where people park for shopping The town centre will become obsolete leading to a loss of jobs. Also this area flooded on 2014 where is the improved infrastructure.	No	Positively prepared, Effective	We need another road off Canvey we only need 1 accident now and the whole of Canvey becomes gridlocked and with the oil refinery we are are disaster waiting to happen	I know we have to have extra houses on Canvey Island but over 2000 is unsustainable	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Need a third road on to Canvey Dangers of Oikos	Third Road The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. Access improvements for Canvey are a strategic matter which cannot be addressed through the Castle Point Plan alone, as any growth is only a	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		proportion of the demand for those access improvements . The bulk of the demand come from the existing 16,000 households on Canvey. However, the strategic need for access improvements to Canvey Island have been identified through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex specifically identifies three projects which will improve accessibility to and from the Island. The Local Transport Plan sits alongside the Castle Point Plan, and the development in the Castle Point Plan will	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. Oikos Policy SD8 covers Developments near Hazardous Uses. Development proposals within the consultation zone will be assessed in accordance with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Guidance who may advise against development on health and safety grounds. The Council will place great weight on the recommendation provided by the HSE.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0645-0001	Individual	Stuart	Clarke		Yes	C5	Yes		No	Effective	I fail to understand how more housing can be put on Canvey with the current levels of access and egress. If one of the major roads on Canvey has an accident then the island is gridlocked. If you want to go off the island at the weekend, don't bother between 10:30 and 14:30, stationary traffic and grid lock. If you want to go to work off the island you need to be gone before 7 am and back before 14:00 or, you've guessed it, gridlock. .The infrastructure is not suitable for additional loading. There has been wishy washy discussion for more years than I can remember about 3rd roads and improved access and nothing is done. You rightly point out the COMAH sites and with these access should be a priority, not another study	Improved access and egress written into the plan rather than comments on studying it.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Third access required onto Canvey Island.	Third Road The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. Access improvements for Canvey are a strategic matter which cannot be addressed through the Castle Point Plan alone, as any growth is only a proportion of the demand for those access improvements . The bulk of the demand come from the existing 16,000 households on Canvey. However, the strategic need for access improvements to Canvey Island have been identified	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex specifically identifies three projects which will improve accessibility to and from the Island. The Local Transport Plan sits alongside the Castle Point Plan, and the development in the Castle Point Plan will make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan.	
0656-0001	Individual	Steven	McGregor		Yes	C5	Yes		No	Justified	The plan could include more information to justify the need of a new route of access, understood it is covered in the Infrastructure development plan. Could include more details of possible options for the crossing even if just an idea	The IDP mentions the Thurrock port but the Thames enterprise park being developed surely improves future business and job opportunities even more . A new bus route created to this area could also further justify the need for the new access. A 16 mile car journey reduced	No	Not Answered	Yes - See attachments		Third road onto Canvey	The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommendin	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											to be developed in the feasibility study.	to 4 mile journey from the same place on Canvey to shell haven Terminal for example. Tunnelling should been considered in the feasibility study to reduce impact on the habitat sites. The mention of raised engineering in the IDP suggests this not considered or deemed too expensive. A method such as cut -and-cover and/ or immersed tube to reduce cost might have a short term impact but as seen with the Conwy tunnel on the A55 it can benefit wildlife once constructed.						g interventions. Access improvements for Canvey are a strategic matter which cannot be addressed through the Castle Point Plan alone, as any growth is only a proportion of the demand for those access improvements . The bulk of the demand come from the existing 16,000 households on Canvey. However, the strategic need for access improvements to Canvey Island have been identified through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex specifically identifies three projects	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		which will improve accessibility to and from the Island. The Local Transport Plan sits alongside the Castle Point Plan, and the development in the Castle Point Plan will make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan.	
0 3 4 1 - 0 0 0 9	Organisati on	Jan et	Nutt al	Nat ural Eng alnd		C5	Yes	We suggest the following changes to the policy wording in point 4 as follows: 'Options in the feasibility study for improvements to access to Canvey Island will be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment and will need to demonstrate to ensure there is no adverse effect on integrity to ensure there is no resulting harm to internationally protected sites'.	Ye s							A	We suggest the following changes to the policy wording in point 4 as follows: 'Options in the feasibility study for improvements to access to Canvey Island will be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment and will need to demonstrate to ensure there is no adverse	<u>Modification</u> 4. Options in the feasibility study for improvements to access to Canvey Island will be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment that will need to demonstrate to ensure there is no	<u>Modific ation</u> 4. Option s in the feasibil ity study for improv ements to access to Canve y Island will be subject

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	effect on integrity to ensure there is no resulting harm to internationally protected sites'.	adverse effect on integrity to ensure there is no resulting harm to internationally protected sites'.	to Habitats Regulations Assessment that will need to demonstrate to ensure there is no adverse effect on integrity to ensure there is no resulting harm to internationally protected sites'.
0694-0001	Individual	Reece	Johnson		Yes	C5	No		No	Positively prepared	Inadequate transport for proposed developments in Canvey island.	Another access route to canvey. Widening of Sommes way and extension of Roscommon way to Thames Road.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Third Road onto Canvey	Third road onto Canvey The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		recommending interventions. Access improvements for Canvey are a strategic matter which cannot be addressed through the Castle Point Plan alone, as any growth is only a proportion of the demand for those access improvements . The bulk of the demand come from the existing 16,000 households on Canvey. However, the strategic need for access improvements to Canvey Island have been identified through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex specifically identifies	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		three projects which will improve accessibility to and from the Island. The Local Transport Plan sits alongside the Castle Point Plan, and the development in the Castle Point Plan will make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan.	
0 7 4 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ga bri ella	Kwo lek		Yes	C5	No	There is no space on canvey to build additional homes. Please not do it	No		Do not build on canvey island. If anything please build another road into the island	Make plans to build another road to canvey do not build more homes	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Third Road onto Canvey	The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. Access improvements for Canvey are a strategic matter which cannot be addressed through the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Castle Point Plan alone, as any growth is only a proportion of the demand for those access improvements . The bulk of the demand come from the existing 16,000 households on Canvey. However, the strategic need for access improvements to Canvey Island have been identified through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementatio n Plan for South Essex specifically identifies three projects which will improve accessibility to and from the Island. The Local Transport Plan sits alongside the Castle Point Plan,	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		and the development in the Castle Point Plan will make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan.	
0805-0001	Individual	Steven	Scarlett		Yes	C5	No	The emergency services will not be able to respond to an emergency on the island due to the excess houses/people moving onto the island and without greater road and service infrastructure in place.	No	Effective	Failure to put adequate road infrastructure in place to support the additional people moving onto the island will restrict the emergency services to respond effectively	Provide additional roads and access onto and off the island	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Emergency services will be unable to access Canvey	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
1012-0009	Agent	Arun	Sriskanda	Oikos Storage Ltd c/o Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd	Yes	C5	Yes		Yes		Oikos welcomes the Council's aspirations to improve access to and around Canvey Island, but as highlighted in representations relating to the previous version of the Local Plan, such improvements are not required to enable the Oikos facility to continue to operate successfully or to accommodate any future potential development at the facility. They could, however, provide additional resilience benefits in respect of the ongoing operations of this nationally significant facility. Oikos would politely request that, along with the other stakeholders referred to in		Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Not required for the operation of the oikos facility and wants to be consulted as this develops	Comments noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											the plan, they are involved as appropriate in the production of the feasibility study.								
0 9 1 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Paul	Kruger		Yes	C5	No	No community involvement and this document is everything that is wrong with this consultation that makes it hard for the average tax paying home owners of Canvey to state their wishes	No	Justified	Access for emergency services on and off the island.	New road access off the island.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Lack of community engagement Third road onto canvey Emergency vehicles	Community Engagament Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. Third road onto Canvey The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. Access improvements for Canvey are a strategic matter which cannot be addressed through the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Castle Point Plan alone, as any growth is only a proportion of the demand for those access improvements . The bulk of the demand come from the existing 16,000 households on Canvey. However, the strategic need for access improvements to Canvey Island have been identified through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex specifically identifies three projects which will improve accessibility to and from the Island. The Local Transport Plan sits alongside the Castle Point Plan,	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		and the development in the Castle Point Plan will make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. Emergency Services Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0323-0004	Organisation	Michael	Atkins	Port of London Authority		C5										A	<u>Policy C5 - Improved Access to and around Canvey Island:</u> The PLA should, where appropriate be consulted on any future proposals to deliver a third access route to/from Canvey as part of a forthcoming feasibility study, informing the first review of the Castle Point Plan to identify options for improving access to, from and	Support noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	within Canvey Island. As part of this welcome that paragraph 8.15 of the reasoned justification recognises the proximity of the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA and Ramsar site and the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar site.		
1440007	Organisation	Joe seph	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	C5	Yes		No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Any discussions on improving routes on and off Canvey must involve RSPB and other stakeholder eNGOs at an early stage, and will need to look into ensuring minimal impacts on priority habitats, LNRS Priority Species, designated sites, functionally linked land, habitat connectivity, pollution, construction and operational disturbance and other impacts, and flyway routes	Any discussions on improving routes on and off Canvey must involve RSPB and other stakeholder eNGOs at an early stage, and will need to look into ensuring minimal impacts on priority habitats, LNRS Priority Species, designated sites, functionally linked land, habitat connectivity, pollution, construction and operational disturbance and other impacts, and flyway routes. Any new infrastructure must not be detrimental to this important and biodiverse are, particularly to designated sites, including Holehaven Creek SSSI and Canvey Wick SSSI, as well as to west Canvey Marsh RSPB reserve.	No				Any discussions on improving routes on and off Canvey must involve RSPB and other stakeholder eNGOs at an early stage, and will need to look into ensuring minimal impacts on priority habitats, LNRS Priority Species, designated sites, functionally linked land, habitat connectivity, pollution, construction and operational disturbance and other impacts, and flyway routes	See modifications proposed	2. This will be prepared in collaboration with key partners including ECC, adjoining district and unitary councils , Transport East, Natural England, Environment Agency, Government departments such as the DfT, BEIS and

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			MHCLG and relevant agencies as well as engagement with the local community. 4. Options in the feasibility study for improvements to access to Canvey Island must seek to minimise environmental impacts and will be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment to ensure there is no adverse

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			effect on integrity resulting harm to internationally protected sites.
1 4 4 1 - 0 0 0 2	Agent	Ru per t	Woo d	Tha mes Ente rpris e Park Ltd	Yes	C5	Yes		No	Consistent with National Policy	Policy C5 identifies the need to improve access to and around Canvey Island, but it should be strengthened to ensure the Local Plan delivers sustainable and strategic connectivity in line with the NPPF.	Improving access to and through the wider South Essex region is critical for long-term economic vitality and quality of life. Current transport links are inadequate, contributing to congestion and limiting Canvey Island's potential for growth. To address this, the policy should include a clear commitment to upgrading the strategic road network, particularly the A130, which provides a key link between Canvey Island and surrounding areas. Enhancing this route will help alleviate congestion and improve access to employment opportunities in Thurrock and beyond. In addition to road improvements, expanding public transport services is essential. More frequent and reliable bus connections between Canvey Island, Basildon, and Thurrock would reduce car dependency and promote sustainable travel. Similarly, integrating cycling infrastructure would provide residents with viable alternatives, supporting carbon reduction and healthier lifestyles. Rail Freight should also be	No				Policy C5 identifies the need to improve access to and around Canvey Island, but it should be strengthened to ensure the Local Plan delivers sustainable and strategic connectivity in line with the NPPF. Improving access to and through the wider South Essex region is critical for long-term economic vitality and quality of life. Current transport links are inadequate, contributing to congestion and limiting Canvey Island's potential for growth. To address this, the policy should include a clear commitment to upgrading the strategic road network, particularly the A130, which provides a key link between Canvey	Access options to Canvey with be investigated in more detail in the forthcoming feasibility study.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												highlighted as a key component to improve the movement of goods into and out of the region. This is essential for supporting sustainable logistics and reducing reliance on road transport. Investing in multimodal transport solutions will ensure Canvey Island remains well-connected and resilient to future growth pressures. This approach will support economic development, environmental sustainability and social inclusion, aligning Policy C5 with NPPF requirements for sustainable and coordinated development. In addition, Castle Point should seek to maximise opportunities relating to the estuary as an economic growth opportunity, recognising its potential for trade, tourism and associated employment benefits.					Island and surrounding areas. Enhancing this route will help alleviate congestion and improve access to employment opportunities in Thurrock and beyond. In addition to road improvements, expanding public transport services is essential. More frequent and reliable bus connections between Canvey Island, Basildon, and Thurrock would reduce car dependency and promote sustainable travel. Similarly, integrating cycling infrastructure would provide residents with viable alternatives, supporting carbon reduction and healthier lifestyles. Rail Freight should also be highlighted as a key component to improve the movement of goods into and out of the region. This is essential for supporting sustainable logistics and		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	reducing reliance on road transport. Investing in multimodal transport solutions will ensure Canvey Island remains well-connected and resilient to future growth pressures. This approach will support economic development, environmental sustainability and social inclusion, aligning Policy C5 with NPPF requirements for sustainable and coordinated development. In addition, Castle Point should seek to maximise opportunities relating to the estuary as an economic growth opportunity, recognising its potential for trade, tourism and associated employment benefits.		
0337-002	Organisation	Alex	Savine	Thurrock Council		C5	Yes	During consultation on the Regulation 18 Castle Point Local Plan, Thurrock Council previously raised an objection to Castle Point's proposal for a Canvey Island (Northwick Road) to Thurrock (A1014 Manorway) road link on grounds of	Yes								TC notes that CPBC intends to prepare a feasibility study (Policy C5) to explore options and welcomes further discussion to provide for better	CPBC and TC agree to collaborate on the feasibility work to explore the options for better access	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								impact on landscape, SSSI, SPAs and highways. Concerns centred on the impact on local communities along the Manorway and the junction of Manorway with A13. At the time of the Regulation 18 consultation, no evidence was provided to justify the scheme in terms of highway modelling, programming, funding, phasing or delivery, nor was there an environmental appraisal of the proposal. We note that the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan has not included this scheme. Instead, Policy C5 commits the Council to undertaking a feasibility study to identify options for improving access to, from and within Canvey Island, including its wider strategic implications. The policy wording clarifies it will be developed in collaboration with ECC and adjoining authorities among others and will undergo Habitat Regulations Assessment. Thurrock Council welcomes this approach and is willing to engage in future discussions on this matter.									access to and from Canvey Island	to and from Canvey Island.	
0341-0010	Organisation	Janet	Nuttall	Natural England		C6	Yes	We welcome the place-based policies focused on protecting important areas of greenspace and their connectivity across the district, e.g. Daws Heath (DH1), Thundersley (Thun4) and the Green Lung (C6). We support the general aims of	Yes							A	We welcome the place-based policies focused on protecting important areas of greenspace and their connectivity across the district, e.g. Daws Heath	Support noted	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								these policies to improve the connectivity and condition of the GI network and its habitats, and address deficiencies in access to greenspace. Policy C6 - The South Canvey Green Lung We support policy C6 to protect the South Canvey Green Lung as an important asset for people and nature, and its aims to align with the Essex LNRS and seek opportunities to create new habitat (e.g. through BNG) wherever possible.									(DH1), Thundersley (Thun4) and the Green Lung (C6). We support the general aims of these policies to improve the connectivity and condition of the GI network and its habitats, and address deficiencies in access to greenspace. Policy C6 - The South Canvey Green Lung We support policy C6 to protect the South Canvey Green Lung as an important asset for people and nature, and its aims to align with the Essex LNRS and seek opportunities to create new habitat (e.g. through BNG) wherever possible.		
1012-0006	Agent	Arun	Sriskanda	Oikos Storage Ltd c/o Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd	Yes	C6	Yes		No	Effective, Justified	Whilst Oikos acknowledge that the policy has been amended to reflect the previous Local Plan Inspector's report regarding the removal of references to landscape and openness, it is considered that the policy still contains unnecessary duplication with policies SP1, ENV3 and ENV4 and, therefore, remains unjustified and ineffective.	Policy C6 should be deleted.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Policy C6 should be deleted. Duplication with policies SP1, ENV3 and ENV4 and, therefore, remains unjustified and ineffective.	Noted. Policy C6 is considered to have an important role to warrant retention.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											Policy C6 continues to protect the area for its ecological value; however, it is noted that the land is already safeguarded through its designation under Policy ENV4 as a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and Potential Local Wildlife Site – which are the subject of a separate representation by Oikos. Similarly, the overarching protection of ecologically valuable sites, securing nature recovery, and the provision of Biodiversity Net Gain are outlined through Policy ENV3. Furthermore, the importance of green infrastructure and the value it provides in connecting ecological networks is addressed through policy SP1. On this basis, it is not clear why an additional policy is required to cover the same matters. It is Oikos’ view, therefore, that for the purposes of clarity, this policy should be deleted.								
0 3 2 3 - 0 0 0 5	Organisati on	Mic hae l	Atki ns	Port of Lon don Auth ority		C6											Policy C6 - The South Canvey Green Lung: In principle support the intention of the policy, with regard to the potential for renewable energy provision within the South Canvey Green Lung where it can be demonstrated that a high level of	Support noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	biodiversity net gain can be secured and there will be no adverse impact on the integrity of nearby Habitats Sites.		
14400008	Organisation	Joseph	Beale	RSPB	Yes	C6	Yes		No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	There is no provision for well designed dog walking park in the area. This will take the pressure of the more sensitive sites and already pressured at West Canvey Marshes and Canvey Wick SSSI. There is also the opportunity to implement flower-rich and low-nutrient pollinator corridors and Nightingale scrub corridors, as per the Essex LNRS habitat and Priority Species measures. It is nonetheless good to see the Essex LNRS embedded in this and other Policies.	Add a sentence about creation of a well-designed dog-walking green space in the area. Add a sentence about the opportunity to implement flower-rich and low-nutrient pollinator corridors and Nightingale scrub corridors, as per the Essex LNRS.	No				There is no provision for well designed dog walking park in the area. This will take the pressure of the more sensitive sites and already pressured at West Canvey Marshes and Canvey Wick SSSI. There is also the opportunity to implement flower-rich and low-nutrient pollinator corridors and Nightingale scrub corridors, as per the Essex LNRS habitat and Priority Species measures. It is nonetheless good to see the Essex LNRS embedded in this and other Policies. Add a sentence about creation of a well-designed dog-walking green space in the area. Add a sentence about the opportunity to implement flower-rich and low-nutrient pollinator	Policy C6(5) already allows for opportunities to develop habitats for priority species, stating ' <i>Development proposals must be designed to enable and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).</i> ' Nonetheless, mods could be included to further address the points about recreational routes, noting that land ownerships	8.56 Whilst most forms of development cannot take place in this area due to the constraints around the port facilities, this is an area where further enhancement of ecology through biodiversity net gain or through long term schemes such as Countryside Stewardship would be

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	corridors and Nightingale scrub corridors, as per the Essex LNRS.	may be a constraint.	encoura ged by the Council. The Green and Blue Infrastru cture Strategy identifie s a long- term opportu nity to establis h a Country Park at the Green Lung and through this, there may be the possibili ty to establis h a well- designe d dog- walking green space in the area.

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0219-0006	Individual	Graham	Bracci		Yes	C7	Yes	CPBC Plan Page 46 4.01 Extract from the 6-Point Plan for Canvey Island, concerning Canvey Lake. “The Section 19 Flood Investigation Report, published by Essex LLFA in September 2014, recommended a thorough investigation into the capacity available in the Canvey Lake. The lake, strategically located in the centre of the Island, forms part of the Island’s surface water drainage system and so ensuring it is kept in a good condition and able to receive surface water during storm events is vital.” 4.02 More Importantly; “In a further report by the government’s Chief Scientist, Sir Mark Walport, it was also mentioned that capacity of this lake needed to be addressed and maintained.” 4.03 “The MAP has completed the first phase of modeling the impacts of dredging the lake, to remove large amounts of silt which have built up over time. The group has also suggested re-profiling the banks of the lake, to provide additional storage capacity in high intensity rainfall events. This increased storage capacity	No	Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy	Summary Statement This representation is submitted in response to the Regulation 19 consultation on the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan 2026–2043. It is our view that the Plan fails all four tests of soundness as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Plan is underpinned by incomplete evidence, lacks consequence-based risk analysis, and proposes development in areas where public safety cannot be guaranteed—particularly on Canvey Island. 1. Is the Plan Positively Prepared ? The Plan is not positively prepared to meet the area’s objectively assessed development needs in a sustainable manner. It adopts a narrow urban-focused strategy that disproportionately exposes vulnerable communities, particularly on Canvey Island, to extreme risks. The prioritisation of Green Belt land over public safety concerns undermines the integrity of the planning process. The Plan selectively identifies flood risk constraints (Footnote 7) and then actively proposes		Yes	To introduce and explain any extra specific supporting evidence in relation to the matters raised in this submission during the Examination in Public (EiP) process		C	No works have been done on Canvey Lake in 10 years despite the 6 point plan	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								could allow surface water to drain away from the network more effectively, whilst increasing the amount of water that could be held. It has been identified that any work on the lake would need to be followed by a regular planned maintenance programme.” 4.04 Canvey Lake is clearly one of the main assets within the Canvey Island surface water drainage system. Despite this and the findings of the government’s Chief Scientist, Sir Mark Walport’s, and the 6–Point Plan recognition, that it is “vital” for the Lake to be kept in good condition to perform its strategic function during storm events, no major work, nor maintenance, on the Lake has been undertaken, in the 10 years since the 2014 Summer Floods.			development in those high-risk areas. The NPPF 2024 explicitly removes the ability for councils to set lower housing targets unless exceptional constraints are proven. While the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey. Conclusion: The Plan does not seek to meet development needs in a sustainable or safe manner. 2. Is the Plan Justified ? The Plan lacks proportionate evidence and fails to consider reasonable alternatives. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) omits site-specific modelling and consequencebased analysis for vulnerable populations. Hazardous installations and port-related activities are inadequately assessed, with no detailed COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards) consequence analysis provided. The plan increases population exposure in the vicinity of known COMAH sites hazard range consequence and flood-prone areas, without demonstrating that safer								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
											alternatives were adequately considered. It fails to identify Canvey Island as a single flood cell requiring open space catchment areas for flood mitigation . Whilst the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey, despite failing to provide the required Level II SFRA Conclusion: The Plan is not based on proportionate evidence and fails to justify its spatial strategy. 3. Is the Plan Effective ? The Plan is not effective or deliverable given the known constraints. Major allocations such as West Canvey Island and the Seaview Road corridor lie within flood zones and lack infrastructure to support emergency planning. Pressures on roads and healthcare are acknowledged but not resolved through binding delivery mechanisms. The primary housing site is not shovel-ready and faces significant delivery time constraints, undermining the Plan’s ability to meet urgent housing needs. Conclusion: The Plan is not										

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											deliverable without significant risk to public safety and infrastructure capacity. 4. Consistent with National Policy ? The Plan fails to meet the housing targets set by the Standard Methodology and does not integrate consequence-based planning for flood risk or hazardous installations. This is contrary to NPPF guidance and Planning Practise Guidance on safe development and resilience. Furthermore, the Plan does not reflect legal duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 or COMAH Regulations to plan for foreseeable emergencies. Conclusion: The Plan is inconsistent with national policy and statutory obligations for riskinformed development. In light of the above, we respectfully request that the Castle Point Local Plan 2026–2043 be withdrawn or substantially revised to address the issues raised in this representation. The Plan must be re-evaluated to ensure it meets the tests of soundness, prioritises public safety, and complies with national policy and legal obligation. Is the Plan Legal ?									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											On the basis that this plan has been constructed by professional planners, we could not consider ourselves qualified to challenge its legality, subsequently we are compelled to respond "YES" to this question. However, this submission sets out to indicate that CPBC draft Reg19 consultation may well prove to be unsound or even illegal, being neither positively prepared nor adequately evidenced. The advice provided at 1.09 and 1.10 of this submission, has not been made lightly and goes some way to support our argument that adopting a wholly no Green Belt development policy, at the expense of public safety is somewhat perverse. Prioritising mainland Green Belt protection without fully accounting for major incident hazard range and the potential for catastrophic flood events on Canvey Island, effectively subdividing the borough’s communities, may make the draft CPBC Plan be deemed not only unreasonable but also unprincipled and corporately illogical.									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0220-0006	Individual	Steve	Sawkins		Yes	C7	Yes	CPBC Plan Page 46 4.01 Extract from the 6-Point Plan for Canvey Island, concerning Canvey Lake. “The Section 19 Flood Investigation Report, published by Essex LLFA in September 2014, recommended a thorough investigation into the capacity available in the Canvey Lake. The lake, strategically located in the centre of the Island, forms part of the Island’s surface water drainage system and so ensuring it is kept in a good condition and able to receive surface water during storm events is vital.” 4.02 More Importantly; “In a further report by the government’s Chief Scientist, Sir Mark Walport, it was also mentioned that capacity of this lake needed to be addressed and maintained.” 4.03 “The MAP has completed the first phase of modeling the impacts of dredging the lake, to remove large amounts of silt which have built up over time. The group has also suggested re-profiling the banks of the lake, to provide additional storage capacity in high intensity rainfall events. This increased storage capacity	No	Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy	Summary Statement This representation is submitted in response to the Regulation 19 consultation on the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan 2026–2043. It is our view that the Plan fails all four tests of soundness as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Plan is underpinned by incomplete evidence, lacks consequence-based risk analysis, and proposes development in areas where public safety cannot be guaranteed—particularly on Canvey Island. 1. Is the Plan Positively Prepared ? The Plan is not positively prepared to meet the area’s objectively assessed development needs in a sustainable manner. It adopts a narrow urban-focused strategy that disproportionately exposes vulnerable communities, particularly on Canvey Island, to extreme risks. The prioritisation of Green Belt land over public safety concerns undermines the integrity of the planning process. The Plan selectively identifies flood risk constraints (Footnote 7) and then actively proposes		Yes	To introduce and explain any extra specific supporting evidence in relation to the matters raised in this submission during the Examination in Public (EiP) process		C	No works have been done on Canvey Lake in 10 years despite the 6 point plan	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								could allow surface water to drain away from the network more effectively, whilst increasing the amount of water that could be held. It has been identified that any work on the lake would need to be followed by a regular planned maintenance programme.” 4.04 Canvey Lake is clearly one of the main assets within the Canvey Island surface water drainage system. Despite this and the findings of the government’s Chief Scientist, Sir Mark Walport’s, and the 6–Point Plan recognition, that it is “vital” for the Lake to be kept in good condition to perform its strategic function during storm events, no major work, nor maintenance, on the Lake has been undertaken, in the 10 years since the 2014 Summer Floods.			development in those high-risk areas. The NPPF 2024 explicitly removes the ability for councils to set lower housing targets unless exceptional constraints are proven. While the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey. Conclusion: The Plan does not seek to meet development needs in a sustainable or safe manner. 2. Is the Plan Justified ? The Plan lacks proportionate evidence and fails to consider reasonable alternatives. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) omits site-specific modelling and consequencebased analysis for vulnerable populations. Hazardous installations and port-related activities are inadequately assessed, with no detailed COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards) consequence analysis provided. The plan increases population exposure in the vicinity of known COMAH sites hazard range consequence and flood-prone areas, without demonstrating that safer								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											alternatives were adequately considered. It fails to identify Canvey Island as a single flood cell requiring open space catchment areas for flood mitigation . Whilst the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey, despite failing to provide the required Level II SFRA Conclusion: The Plan is not based on proportionate evidence and fails to justify its spatial strategy. 3. Is the Plan Effective ? The Plan is not effective or deliverable given the known constraints. Major allocations such as West Canvey Island and the Seaview Road corridor lie within flood zones and lack infrastructure to support emergency planning. Pressures on roads and healthcare are acknowledged but not resolved through binding delivery mechanisms. The primary housing site is not shovel-ready and faces significant delivery time constraints, undermining the Plan’s ability to meet urgent housing needs. Conclusion: The Plan is not									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
											deliverable without significant risk to public safety and infrastructure capacity. 4. Consistent with National Policy ? The Plan fails to meet the housing targets set by the Standard Methodology and does not integrate consequence-based planning for flood risk or hazardous installations. This is contrary to NPPF guidance and Planning Practise Guidance on safe development and resilience. Furthermore, the Plan does not reflect legal duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 or COMAH Regulations to plan for foreseeable emergencies. Conclusion: The Plan is inconsistent with national policy and statutory obligations for riskinformed development. In light of the above, we respectfully request that the Castle Point Local Plan 2026–2043 be withdrawn or substantially revised to address the issues raised in this representation. The Plan must be re-evaluated to ensure it meets the tests of soundness, prioritises public safety, and complies with national policy and legal obligation. Is the Plan Legal ?										

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											On the basis that this plan has been constructed by professional planners, we could not consider ourselves qualified to challenge its legality, subsequently we are compelled to respond "YES" to this question. However, this submission sets out to indicate that CPBC draft Reg19 consultation may well prove to be unsound or even illegal, being neither positively prepared nor adequately evidenced. The advice provided at 1.09 and 1.10 of this submission, has not been made lightly and goes some way to support our argument that adopting a wholly no Green Belt development policy, at the expense of public safety is somewhat perverse. Prioritising mainland Green Belt protection without fully accounting for major incident hazard range and the potential for catastrophic flood events on Canvey Island, effectively subdividing the borough’s communities, may make the draft CPBC Plan be deemed not only unreasonable but also unprincipled and corporately illogical.									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0310005	Individual	Martin	England		Yes	C7		CPBC Plan Page 46+J559 4.01 Extract from the 6-Point Plan for Canvey Island, concerning Canvey Lake. "The Section 19 F+J559	No	Justified, consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number		Yes	As Head of the Save Hadleigh Farmland Group I would like to put the case forward as to why our site is still at risk with a local plan that will be found uns	No	A	Dredge Canvey Lake Policy C7 Agrees with improving the Canvey Lake area being master planned as a multi-functional well-used green space. Development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. Over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications.	<u>Policy C7</u> comments noted <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. SUDS Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	Y - Policy SD3(3) 'Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the constraints of the specific geographic location, site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex, the

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d					
											of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. I do agree with Policy C7 about improving the Canvey Lake area and will be master planned as a multi-functional well-used green space. This will deliver an increased capacity of the Lake from dredging for flood water storage (attenuation area), reducing flood risk to those living on the periphery of the lake, a long-term management plan of the			ound, which will the n lea d to spe cul ativ e dev elo pm ent acr oss our pre cio us Gre enb elt site s. Als o, the ove r dev elo pm ent with this pla n will cau se unt										Castle Point Strategi c Flood Risk Assess ment (SFRA) and recomm endatio ns/advic e from statutor y bodies (includi ng EA, Essex LLFA).'

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											lake to ensure the flood mitigation remains effective, improvements to water quality, a long-term management plan to maintain high quality water standards, enhancements to the habitat surrounding the lake, an environment to create an attractive and functional area, and also identified as an area of particular importance for biodiversity within the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy which is protected and where possible enhanced. I concur with the many statements made within this policy, that Canvey Island suffers from high levels of surface water flood risk, and during times of higher rainfall Canvey Lake becomes an important depository for excess rainwater, that poor water quality is unsafe for users, animals and biodiversity to thrive, we need to further improve the natural environment in this area and achieve the best outcomes for the natural environment, and that further work should be undertaken into the functionality of the lake and how water quality, with surface water runoff contaminates, should be managed and maintained in the future, that the Canvey Island 6 Point Plan was			old issues to the local urban areas, when there are viable sites available which have not been seriously considered, like NW Thundersley. Also, as a					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											undertaken in 2015, which identified Canvey Lake as an important asset in managing flood water on the Island, particularly during storm events, and recommended that the capacity of the lake should be investigated, addressed, and achieved through dredging and re-profiling the banks of the lake to provide additional storage capacity, with planned regular maintenance, which would provide huge benefits for the surrounding homes, which are impacted by flooding in this area, and that Canvey Lake acts as a habitat to many different wildlife, including waterbirds and some aquatic life, there are risks to wildlife due to the water quality, however, there are huge opportunities to improve this through management of the water and to enhance wildlife through creation of new and improved habitats. This is the vision we need for Canvey Lake.			Co mm itte e Me mb er for the Frie nds of Can vey Lak e gro up I wou ld like to put the cas e for war d as to why our lake is still at risk with this pla n that put s ove					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														r thre e tho usa nds hou ses on Can vey Isla nd, but whe n fou nd uns oun d, will lea d to spe cul ativ e dev elo pm ent acr oss our pre cio us Gre enb elt site s, with the					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														additional houses on our Grey Belt sites on Canvey, when there are viable sites available which have not been seriously considered, like NW Thundersley.					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0385-003	Individual	Lukas	Burry		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residenets in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long-term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.	No			A	Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance of the lake is upkept and will detail who is responsible for this.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policy C7 repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policy C7's vision for improving Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However,								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											without concrete delivery- mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								
0 3 8 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Del ia	Sear le		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long- term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members	No			A	Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance of the lake is upkept and will detail who is responsible for this.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residenets in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policy C7 repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policv C7's vision for	championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.							

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											improving. Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However, without concrete delivery mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								
0387-0003	Individual	Bernard	Searle		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long-term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements.				A	Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residenets in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policv C7	Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.												of the lake is upkept and will detail who is responsible for this.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policy C7's vision for improving. Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water.quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However, without concrete delivery mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0388-0003	Individual	Tracy	Searle		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residenets in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long-term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.				A	Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance of the lake is upkept and will detail who is responsible for this.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policy C7 repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policy C7's vision for improving Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However,								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											without concrete delivery- mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								
0 3 8 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Har vey	Burr y		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long- term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members				A	Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance of the lake is upkept and will detail who is responsible for this.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residenets in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policy C7 repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policv C7's vision for	championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											improving. Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However, without concrete delivery mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								
0390-0003	Individual	Stacy	Sibthorp		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long-term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements.					Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d					
											development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residenets in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policv C7	Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.											of the lake is upkeepd and will detail who is responsible for this.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policy C7's vision for improving. Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water.quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However, without concrete delivery mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0391-0003	Individual	Perry	Hall		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long-term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.					Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance of the lake is upkept and will detail who is responsible for this.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policy C7 repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policy C7's vision for improving Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However,								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											without concrete delivery- mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								
0 3 9 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Dav e	Wah s		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long- term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members				A	Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance of the lake is upkept and will detail who is responsible for this.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residenets in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policy C7 repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policy C7's vision for	championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.							

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											improving. Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However, without concrete delivery mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								
0 4 6 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Philip	Bournes		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long-term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements.					Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d					
											development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residenets in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policv C7	Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.											of the lake is upkeepd and will detail who is responsible for this.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policy C7's vision for improving. Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water.quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However, without concrete delivery mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0469-0003		Colby	Cunningham		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residenets in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long-term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.					Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance of the lake is upkept and will detail who is responsible for this.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policy C7 repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policy C7's vision for improving Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However,								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											without concrete delivery- mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								
0 4 7 0 - 0 0 0 3		Ch eryl	Ray		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No Credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy, Effective	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2 year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long- term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members	No				Policy C7 Lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments No maintenance in 10 years despite the 6 point plan Agree with the vision for improving canvey lake Engage with friends of Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained. By requiring a management plan, it will ensure that the maintenance of the lake is upkept and will detail who is responsible for this.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											speculative development. All; Greenbelt .sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey-is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residenets in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective- because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging, to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policy C7 repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policv C7's vision for	championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.							

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											improving. Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water.quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However, without concrete delivery mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled, promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								
0648-0002	Individual	Derek	Murton		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state	HOUSING MODIFICATIONS:Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2-year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long-term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake	No	Not Answered		C	Policy C7 is not effective because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments agree with the vision for improving Canvey Lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development. All Greenbelt sites on Canvey West need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites, especially on Canvey. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. This over development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Policy C7 is not effective because it lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging to increase lake capacity for flood storage - yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policy C7 repeats the same promises without addressing why previous commitments	capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											failed, providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or ongoing maintenance schedules. I do agree with Policy C7's vision for improving Canvey Lake - delivering increased capacity through dredging for flood water storage, reducing flood risk, creating a long-term management plan, improving water quality, and enhancing habitat. Canvey Island suffers from high surface water flood risk, the lake serves as an important rainwater depository, and current poor water quality threatens users, animals and biodiversity. However, without concrete delivery mechanisms and learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade long delay, Policy C7 risks becoming another unfulfilled promise while flood risks to Canvey Lake continue to increase.								
0656-0004	Individual	Steven	McGregor		Yes	C7	Yes		Yes				No	Not Answered	Yes - See attachments		Policy C7 is sound and legally compliant	Support noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 9 6 7 - 0 0 0 4	Individual	Kell y	Bulli s		Yes	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000. Dredge Canvey Lake !!	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Support for Policy C7	Support noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. I do agree with Policy C7 about improving the Canvey Lake. This needs to deliver an increased capacity of the Lake from dredging for flood water storage, reduce the flood risk, a long-term management plan of the lake, improve and maintain water quality, enhancements to the habitat surrounding the lake, an environment to create an attractive and functional area, and also identified as an area of particular importance for biodiversity within the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy. I concur with the many statements made within this policy, that Canvey Island suffers from high levels of surface water flood risk, and with higher rainfall Canvey									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											Lake becomes an important depository for excess rainwater, poor water quality is unsafe for users, animals and biodiversity to thrive, we need to further improve this natural environment, and how surface water runoff contaminates should be managed, the Canvey Island 6 Point Plan was undertaken in 2015, about Canvey and recommended the capacity of the lake should be investigated and achieved through to provide additional storage capacity, and that Canvey Lake acts as a habitat to many different wildlife, including waterbirds and some aquatic life with the risks to wildlife due to the water quality. This is the vision we need for Canvey Lake.									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1025-0006	Individual	Martin	England		Yes	C7	No	The draft plan is not legally compliant as it fails to consider strategic alternatives, like North West Thundersley, which has been excluded, the Biodiversity and environmental protection needs strengthening, there is no credible five-year housing land supply and a lack of evidence on cross-boundary infrastructure with a duty to cooperate. The policy of not building on the Greenbelt is biased and predetermined.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Add the Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites of Kings Park HO31. Add the Greenbelt site of Land East of Manor Trading S0145 SHLAA 2018. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Benfleet at 347, Thundersley at 643, and Hadleigh at 305, keeping Existing Commitments 480, and Windfall Allowance 675. Total housing target of 11,000	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Dredge Canvey Lake Policy C7 Agrees with improving the Canvey Lake area being master planned as a multi-functional well-used green space. Development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. Over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications.	<u>Policy C7</u> comments noted <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. SUDS Policy SD3 covers SuDS and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. I do agree with Policy C7 about improving the Canvey Lake area and will be master planned as a multi-functional well-used green space. This will deliver an increased capacity of the Lake from dredging for flood water storage (attenuation area), reducing flood risk to those living on the periphery of the lake, a long-term management plan of the lake to ensure the flood mitigation remains effective, improvements to water quality, a long-term management plan to maintain high quality water standards, enhancements to the habitat surrounding the									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											lake, an environment to create an attractive and functional area, and also identified as an area of particular importance for biodiversity within the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy which is protected and where possible enhanced. I concur with the many statements made within this policy, that Canvey Island suffers from high levels of surface water flood risk, and during times of higher rainfall Canvey Lake becomes an important depository for excess rainwater, that poor water quality is unsafe for users, animals and biodiversity to thrive, we need to further improve the natural environment in this area and achieve the best outcomes for the natural environment, and that further work should be undertaken into the functionality of the lake and how water quality, with surface water runoff contaminates, should be managed and maintained in the future, that the Canvey Island 6 Point Plan was undertaken in 2015, which identified Canvey Lake as an important asset in managing flood water on the Island, particularly during storm events, and recommended that the capacity of the lake should be investigated.									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											addressed, and achieved through dredging and re-profiling the banks of the lake to provide additional storage capacity, with planned regular maintenance, which would provide huge benefits for the surrounding homes, which are impacted by flooding in this area, and that Canvey Lake acts as a habitat to many different wildlife, including waterbirds and some aquatic life, there are risks to wildlife due to the water quality, however, there are huge opportunities to improve this through management of the water and to enhance wildlife through creation of new and improved habitats. This is the vision we need for Canvey Lake.								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1039-0002	Not Answered	Duncan	Gotobed		Not Answered	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Inconsistency with National Policy: The draft local plan does not align with national policy requirements and fails to meet Castle Point's housing targets. Site selection disregards Green Belt and Grey Belt considerations, contrary to updated NPPF guidelines. The plan violates NPPF principles by directing development toward areas at highest flood risk rather than away from them. Lack of Justification: The site selection strategy demonstrates predetermined bias toward a "no Green Belt build" policy without proper justification. The approach relies on overdeveloping brownfield sites while systematically excluding Green Belt and Grey Belt sites from consideration (e.g. North West Thundersley). An unsound plan will expose all Green Belt sites to speculative development pressure, when Green Belt sites on Canvey West require total protection from government intervention. Policy Ineffectiveness: Policy C7 lacks clear delivery mechanisms and ongoing maintenance commitments, making it fundamentally ineffective. The 2015 Canvey Island 6 Point Plan recommended dredging to	HOUSING MODIFICATIONS: Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2-year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long-term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.	No	Not Answered		A	Supports the vision of C7 but wants more commitment to delivery mechanisms, timescales and maintenance and engage with friends of canvey lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											increase lake capacity for flood storage, yet nearly 10 years later, these critical recommendations remain undelivered. Policy C7 repeats identical promises without addressing why previous commitments failed or providing concrete delivery timelines, funding sources, or maintenance schedules. Infrastructure and Safety Concerns: The proposed 3,316 urban homes for Canvey lacks meaningful resident consultation. Canvey West development compromises emergency evacuation procedures, placing eastern residents at increased risk. This overdevelopment policy will strain highways and traffic capacity, overwhelm inadequate infrastructure, exceed sewage system capacity, exploit poor drainage systems, and increase flood risks to Canvey Lake. SUDS Inappropriateness: Proposed SUDS measures are unsuitable for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. Support for C7 Vision with Implementation Concerns: While supporting Policy C7's vision for improving Canvey Lake, flood risk reduction, long-term management								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											planning, water quality improvements, and habitat enhancement, the policy lacks concrete delivery mechanisms. Given CPBC's decade-long multi-agency partnership has failed to deliver meaningful outcomes for Canvey Lake's complex environmental and infrastructure needs, Policy C7 provides no commitments regarding funding sources, delivery timelines, or maintenance responsibilities.								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1042-0002	Not Answered	Andrea	Gottobed		Not Answered	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Not Following National Policy: The draft local plan doesn't follow national policy rules and fails to meet Castle Point's housing targets. The way they've chosen sites ignores Green Belt and Grey Belt land, which goes against updated national planning guidelines. The plan breaks national rules by putting new housing in flood risk areas instead of keeping it away from them. Poor Justification: The site selection is biased - they've already decided not to build on Green Belt land without giving proper reasons why. They're cramming too many houses onto brownfield sites while deliberately ignoring Green Belt and Grey Belt options (e.g. North West Thundersley). A weak plan like this will put all Green Belt sites at risk from developers, when Green Belt areas on Canvey West need complete protection from government interference. Policy C7 Doesn't Work: Policy C7 has no clear plans for how things will actually get done or who will pay for ongoing maintenance. Back in 2015, the Canvey Island 6 Point Plan said the lake needed dredging for flood storage - nearly 10 years later, nothing has happened.	HOUSING MODIFICATIONS: Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000. LAKE DELIVERY FRAMEWORK: Establish firm 2-year timeline for comprehensive lake dredging with dedicated funding and delivery agency. Create annual maintenance dredging schedule with long-term budget allocation. Set measurable targets for lake capacity increase and water quality improvements. Designate responsible agency for ongoing lake management with annual progress reporting and community consultation. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Engage with Friends of Canvey Lake, a community group, with 2.5k members championing the reset of Canvey Lake to its pre-2010 conditions, to ensure resident-led lake management improvements.	No	Not Answered		A	Supports the vision of C7 but wants more commitment to delivery mechanisms, timescales and maintenance and engage with friends of canvey lake	Comments noted. The purpose of Policy C7 is to improve the space as a multifunctional green space and include a long term management plan to ensure its upkeep is maintained	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											Policy C7 makes the same promises without explaining why previous plans failed or providing proper timelines, funding, or maintenance plans. Infrastructure and Safety Problems: The 3,316 new homes planned for Canvey haven't been properly discussed with residents. Canvey West development will make emergency evacuations harder for people in the east, putting them at greater risk. This overdevelopment will overload roads and traffic, overwhelm poor infrastructure, exceed sewage capacity, strain inadequate drainage systems, and increase flood risks to Canvey Lake. Drainage Solutions Won't Work: The proposed drainage measures aren't suitable for Canvey Island's unique geography and existing drainage problems. Canvey Lake Vision While the goals of Policy C7 are good - reducing flood risks, better management, cleaner water, and improving wildlife - the policy has no proper delivery plans. Without learning from the 6 Point Plan's decade of delays, Policy C7 will just become another broken									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											promise while flood risks keep getting worse.								
1 0 7 2 - 0 0 0 2	Not Answered	Har ry	Engl and		Not Answ ered	C7	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines.It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be	Add North West Thundersley site, reduce the urban housing target by half, Dredge Canvey Lake !!	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Supports Policy C7 - Canvey LakeWants the lake to be dredged	Support noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island’s unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.This over development policy for Canvey will affect highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and poor drainage system on Canvey, and enhance the flood risks to Canvey Lake.I do agree with Policy C7 about improving the Canvey Lake. This needs to deliver an increased capacity of the Lake from dredging for flood water storage, reduce the flood risk, a long-term management plan of the lake, improve and maintain water quality, enhancements to the habitat surrounding the lake, an environment to create an attractive and functional area, and also identified as an area of particular importance for biodiversity within the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy. I concur with the many statements made within this policy, that Canvey Island suffers from high levels of surface water flood risk, and with higher rainfall Canvey									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											Lake becomes an important depository for excess rainwater, poor water quality is unsafe for users, animals and biodiversity to thrive, we need to further improve this natural environment, and how surface water runoff contaminates should be managed, the Canvey Island 6 Point Plan was undertaken in 2015, about Canvey and recommended the capacity of the lake should be investigated and achieved through to provide additional storage capacity, and that Canvey Lake acts as a habitat to many different wildlife, including waterbirds and some aquatic life with the risks to wildlife due to the water quality. This is the vision we need for Canvey Lake.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 8 2 3 - 0 0 0 8	Organisati on	Pat	Abb ott	Envi ron men t Age ncy	Yes	C8	Yes		No	Consistent with national policy	We find part of Policy C8 (4.b.) unsound. The policy promotes a principle of increased residential development on these sites, but does not clearly state that increases in residential development on these sites cannot be in the form of Park Homes. These sites, Kings Park and Sandy Bay, lie within Flood Zone 3. Park homes intended for permanent residential use are classified by Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification of the NPPF as “highly vulnerable”. Table 2 (para 079) of the Flood risk and coastal change PPG states that “Highly vulnerable” classes of development are incompatible with Flood Zones 3a and 3b and that those forms of development “should not be permitted”. The reasoning as to why permanently occupied caravan, mobile home and park home sites were considered to have a high vulnerability to flooding was first given in Para 70 of PPG25 (2001) which stated:- “Caravan, camping and other temporary occupancy sites give rise to special problems in relation to flooding. They have often been located on coastal or riverside sites with a high risk of flooding. The instability of caravans places		No	Not Ans wer ed		A	The EA raised concerns over the increased residential development on these sites, which are in Flood Zone 3, and which would not be permitted as compatible development under current Guidance as set out in table 2 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance when considering the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification of residential park homes (from Annex 2 of the NPPF).	With reference to paragraph 8.66 of the Plan, these sites have come forward under existing 50+ year old planning consents which permit the siting of caravans under the provisions of the Caravans Act 1960 and within the definition at the time this included Park Homes. The planning consents have no time constraints on development and no restrictions on whether the uses are for permanent or temporary seasonal accommodati on. There is some scope under licencing of these sites to control the development of these sites. However, the	“4. Any redevelo pment of these sites will be accepta ble where: 4.a. The risk to occupan ts and property from flood risk and other hazards are minimis ed. With residential development having regard for flood resilient design can be found in Improvi ng the Flood Perform ance of New Building s and Building a Flood Resilien t Future.

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											their occupants at special risk and it may be difficult to operate an effective flood warning system. Such development should be refused in the areas at highest risk, where overtopping or breach of defences would lead to rapid inundation, as should proposed changes of use to residential mobile homes or permanent housing”. This principle was maintained and clarified when PPS25 replaced PPG25 in 2006 with the introduction of the Flood Zones and the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification and the compatibility table of Flood Risk Vulnerability relative to Flood Zone (Annex D: Tables D1, D2 & D3 of PPS25). Paragraphs D19 to D21 of PPS25 Annex D gave the reasoning for classing permanent occupied/residential and temporary occupied/holiday caravan sites differently stating:- “D19. Land used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping, other temporary occupancy sites and permanently occupied caravan, mobile home and ‘park home’ sites that use similar structures give rise to special problems in relation to flooding. Caravan or park-home sites intended for permanent occupation are regarded as ‘highly								local plan’s ability to influence the development of these sites is limited. The Council is keen to encourage that any dwellings on these sites are flood-resilient and has proposed changes to the policy to 4.a. and 4.b.	All proposed development seeking planning permission should be accompanied by a flood emergency plan, demonstrating the steps that will be taken to manage flood risk. 4.b. The overall quantum of residential development is retained, or increased;

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											vulnerable’. The instability of such structures places their occupants at special risk and they are likely to be occupied during periods when flood risk is likely to be higher. D20. Sites intended for temporary occupation are classified as ‘more vulnerable’ because they are usually occupied at times of the year when flood events are less likely to occur, although they may be located for amenity and recreational reasons on coastal or riverside sites with a high residual risk of flooding. However, the attractiveness of waterside sites for holiday accommodation also has to be recognised, provided that proper warning and evacuation arrangements are put in place through appropriate planning conditions. D21. In either case, the Sequential Test and Exception Test should be used by decision-makers (where applicable, – remembering that ‘highly vulnerable’ development should not be permitted in Zones 3a and 3b and ‘more vulnerable’ development should not be permitted in Zone 3b). FRAs should pay particular attention to the management of residual risk, flood warning arrangements and								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											evacuation plans should be considered (see Annex G)”. The NPPF and the Flood risk and coastal change NPPG maintain this position of “highly vulnerable” development classes being incompatible with Flood Zones 3a and 3b as can be seen in Table 2 of the PPG which is a retained version of Table D3 from PPS25. The NPPF is clear in paragraph 170 that Inappropriate development should be avoided in areas of highest risk. Table 2 of the PPG (which helps the LPA to apply the Sequential Test) states clearly that “highly vulnerable” classes of development should not be permitted in Flood Zones 3a or 3b. Both Sandy Bay and Kings Park lie within Flood Zone 3a. The Local Plan policy should better clarify the types of redevelopment that would be acceptable on this site, particularly if there is to be an increase in the overall quantum of residential development, for example a minimum of 2-storey flood resilient dwelling houses or blocks of flats (with no self-contained ground floor residential uses for flats) to replace conventional Park Homes. This would help to improve the flood resilience of housing on the site and provide better provisions for residents to be safe should								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											flooding affect the sites. Currently part 4.c. of Policy C8 can be interpreted as any redevelopment will be acceptable if development (either Park Homes or conventional dwelling houses) retains or increases the number of residences. We feel that this part of the policy could be re-written to better reflect the spirit of the supporting text in the Reasoned Justification (para 8.69) and to offset any interpretation that the council is compliant to proposals that would seek to site a greater number of Park Homes on these sites and reflect the policies set out in the NPPF and PPG.								
0282-0012	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	C8	Not Stated		No	Effective	ECC welcomes reference in paragraph 8.70 that any redevelopment of these sites must capture any change in likely infrastructure demand, in particular the new demand on school places compared to the current typically older residents. Any new housing would be deemed `windfall` development. Any cumulative assessment undertaken consistent with Section 3.4 of the Essex County Council Local and Neighbourhood Planners' Guide to School Organisation and Place Planning (February 2025) would not be able to		Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evid	B	Any development at Residential Park Home Sites would require to be included in cumulative assessment for primary education and early years provision.	Noted. CPBC will work with ECC to undertake a further cumulative assessment to identify the necessary primary, secondary, early years education and childcare and SEND requirements including any impact arising from re-development from the	e. Development proposals must be designed to protect and enhance ~~enable~~ ~~and~~ ~~support~~ the habitat priority measures identified within

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											consider the impact of this potential growth alongside the 675 homes arising from other windfall. Consequently, any cumulative assessment would help establish any headroom in existing schools once Plan growth has been accounted for.				ence			Residential Park Home Sites. In January 2026, ECC provided addendums to the education assessments previously undertaken in November 2025.	the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).
0336-0009	Organisation	Caroline	Peters	Essex Police		C8	Not Stated	It is advised there is engagement with the DOCO when designing residential Park Homes. Due to the locations of park homes and the structure of the buildings they can be difficult to secure, it is however advised they are designed to be a safe and secure as possible to prevent crime and antisocial behaviour. At the appropriate time within the planning process, we would strongly advocate the use of Planning Condition to secure engagement with the DOCO in relation to the application of CPTED principles.	Not Stated							A	It is advised there is engagement with the DOCO when designing residential Park Homes. At the appropriate time within the planning process, we would strongly advocate the use of Planning Condition to secure engagement with the DOCO in relation to the application of CPTED principles.	As stated at paragraph 8.66 often these sites have come forward under existing planning consents but where possible Essex police will be consulted	N
0704-0003	Individual	Kevin	Walker		Yes	C9	No	Not all factors have been regarded	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	To build 185+ new homes in this area would cause the loss of small businesses that run at that end of the island as there are no financially viable places for those businesses to move to That end of Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable	No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative emergency exit from the Island. Suggestion: The Blinking Owl site located in North West Thundersley is currently being utilised for industrial purposes. It has good transport links allowing for a	No	Not Answered			Objecting to Charfleets	Charfleets Industrial Estate is included within Policy E1 which includes the statement 'the Council will seek to provide and retain Class	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											burden on the current drainage system. Additional amenities have not been considered, including extra medical practices, dental services, and new senior educational institutions.	substantial allocation of housing without adversely affecting the traffic flow in the remainder of Castle Point.						E(g), B2 and B8 use classes or other 'sui generis' uses of a similar employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes'. This policy will apply until such time as a master plan for West Canvey has been developed. Policy E1 may subsequently change in terms of its approach to Charfleets when the Castle Point Plan is reviewed in 5 years' time, to enable the delivery of the West Canvey regeneration.	
0 9 8 8 - 0	Agent			Pers imm on Ho mes Ltd	Yes	C9	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent	2.27. Allocation C9 Land at the Point, Canvey Island would see the re-development of employment land. The policy states that it would secure re-provision of						Objecting to the loss of employment land at C9 Complicated site for delivery due to mixed use and	Policy C9 requires a masterplan in order to ensure comprehensiv	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 1 1				c/o Peg asus Gro up						with national policy	employment at West Canvey. However, Allocation C4 West Canvey states it would secure a modest increase in commercial provision to support economic growth. The policy does not acknowledge or support the re-provision or relocation of existing employment that would be lost at C9. 2.28. In addition, C9 would be a large and complicated site, with proposals to deliver both housing and employment on the same site – that already accommodates various uses. For effective delivery, a master developer would be required to ensure a clear vision is set from the outset, and then delivery in accordance with that vision is achieved. This does not seem to have been identified or considered by the Council.						would require a master developer	e development is achieved. As detailed in the policy reprovision at west canvey of any lost employment land is required. Policy C4 at canvey allows for atleast a 10% increase in employment land provision which would allow for this accommodation .	
0 3 2 3 - 0 0 0 6	Organisati on	Mic hae l	Atki ns	Port of Lon don Auth ority		C9											Policy C9 – Land at the Point, Canvey Island: Support the reference on the need to ensure access to smallgains marina is maintained for water-based recreation as part of any future development at this location.	Support noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0823-0004	Organisation	Pat	Abbott	Environment Agency	Yes	Canvey Island	Yes		Yes		Paragraph 8.26 – We welcome the Council’s commitment to develop a Riverside Strategy with the Environment Agency and other partners and to confirm that the Masterplan for the Seafront Entertainment Area will need to reflect this Strategy.Paragraph 8.30 - We welcome the Council’s reference, in the context of Port-related development, to the safeguarded area for protecting future flooddefence infrastructure improvement and maintenance interests.	Paragraph 8.26 – We welcome the Council’s commitment to develop a Riverside Strategy with the Environment Agency and other partners and to confirm that the Masterplan for the Seafront Entertainment Area will need to reflect this Strategy. Paragraph 8.30 - We welcome the Council’s reference, in the context of Port-related development, to the safeguarded area for protecting future flood defence infrastructure improvement and maintenance interests.	No	Not Answered		A	Supports the text in paragraphs 8.26 and 8.30	Support noted.	N
0338-0005	Organisation	Catherine	Bicknell	NHS Mid and South Essex		Canvey Island	Yes	Taken together the Canvey place policies seek to deliver new housing, deliver improvements to the town centre environment guided by a master planning process, maintain and improve open spaces and public realm, and enhance accessibility to and around the island. Similar policies are proposed for other places in the district.	Yes		The ICB supports the inclusion of these policies and requests that their effectiveness in improving health in existing areas and reducing health inequalities that exist in the district is monitored and opportunities are taken to amend policies to improve performance in these areas as appropriate.					A	The ICB supports the inclusion of these policies and requests that their effectiveness in improving health in existing areas and reducing health inequalities that exist in the district is monitored and opportunities are taken to amend policies to improve performance in these areas as appropriate.	Support noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0282-0075	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	Cha pter 22 - Mo nito ring Fra me wor k	Not Sta ted		No	Effective	The Monitoring Table does not include a specific indicator to track the delivery of Supported and Specialist Housing (SSH), as raised in ECC’s Regulation 18 response. Reference should be made to Policy Hou4 rather than Hou5 – Specialist Housing Requirements While the framework refers to “annual specific housing needs completions,” this terminology is not sufficiently clear to ensure effective monitoring of SSH delivery. ECC notes that this may be intended to capture SSH, but the wording does not explicitly reflect the range of accommodation types covered under Policy Hou4. The Plan does not currently include monitoring indicators for Policy Hou4, Criteria 1a to track the compliance with the M4(2) standard. The proposed amendment is supported by evidence in the Local Housing Needs Assessment (2023) and the Essex Supported and Specialist Housing and Accommodation Needs Assessment (SSHANA, 2025). Monitoring delivery of SSH is necessary to demonstrate how the Plan supports ECC’s commissioning	ECC require the replacement of the following monitoring indicator to be consistent with the indicator for SD4 Number of Whole Life Cycle Carbon Assessments submitted meeting all targets and replace with Number of buildings designed to lower embodied carbon and meet upfront embodied carbon emissions targets . ECC requires the following amendment to Monitoring Indicators 16 and 18 to read: Policy Hou45 – Specialist Housing Requirements Monitoring Indicator • % of all new homes built to standard M4(2) ECC requires the following amendment to Monitoring Indicators 16 and 18 to read: Policy Hou45 – Specialist Housing Requirements Monitoring Indicator • % of all new homes built to standard M4(3) ECC requires the following amendment to Monitoring Indicators 16 and 18 to read: Policy Hou45 – Specialist Housing Requirements Monitoring Indicator • the annual delivery of retirement, sheltered homes by tenure	Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie d 8 addi tional app endi ces con taini ng vari ous piec es of evid enc e	B	Requires an alternative monitoring indicator of the number of buildings designed to lower embodied carbon and meet upfront embodied carbon emissions targets Requires the addition of monitoring indicator of the annual delivery of retirement, sheltered homes by tenure and the annual delivery of extra care units by tenure Requires that Supported and Specialist housing M4(3) to be reported within the monitoring of development Need to add a monitoring indicator for Policy HOU4 to track annual delivery of specialist housing types. Change to reference nursing care beds rather than extra care beds Include additional monitoring criteria to track health and wellbeing outcomes.	Accepted and monitoring indicator added CPBC agrees to add a further monitoring indicator for specialist housing requirements Accepted and text amended for monitoring to include the percentage of M4 (3) standard housing have been provided within the development Accepted and text amended and monitoring indicator added to track annual delivery of specialist housing in annual monitoring reports Accepted. Additional monitoring indicators around hot takeaway planning applications included and	Number of Whole Life Cycle Carbon Assessments submitted meeting all targets Number of building s designed to lower embodie d carbon and meet upfront embodie d carbon emission s targets Annual Specific Housing Needs Complet ions % of all new homes built to standard M4(3) Annual delivery of retireme nt, sheltere

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											priorities and statutory duties under the Care Act 2014 and Children Act 1989. It also supports consistency with NPPF, paragraph 63, which requires Plans to establish need, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community including affordable housing (including Social Rent); families with children; looked after children, older people (including those who require retirement housing, housing with-care and care homes); and people with disabilities. The Monitoring Table does not include a specific indicator to track the delivery of Supported and Specialist Housing (SSH), as raised in ECC’s Regulation 18 response. Reference should be made to Policy Hou4 rather than Hou5 – Specialist Housing Requirements While the framework refers to “annual specific housing needs completions,” this terminology is not sufficiently clear to ensure effective monitoring of SSH delivery. ECC notes that this may be intended to capture SSH, but the wording does not explicitly reflect the range of accommodation types covered under Policy Hou4.	- the annual delivery of extra care units by tenure ECC requires the following amendment to Monitoring Indicators 16 and 18 to read: Policy Hou45 – Specialist Housing Requirements Monitoring Indicator - the annual delivery of residential care beds by tenure - the annual delivery of nursing care beds by tenure ECC recommend including the following indicators: - Number of Health Impact Assessments submitted in accordance with Policy Infra3 - Submission of Health Impact Assessment for Hot Food Takeaway Applications in accordance with Policy TC5 - Number of Hot Food Takeaway Applications refused in accordance with Policy TC5							additional text referencing INFRA3 for submission of health impact assessments	d homes Annual delivery of extra care units Submission of Health Impact Assessments Number of Health Impact Assessments submitted in accordance with Policy Infra3 Number of Health Impact Assessment for Hot Food Takeaway Applications in accordance with Policy TC5 Number of Hot

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d							
											The Plan does not currently include monitoring indicators for Policy Hou4, Criteria 1b to track the compliance with the M4(3) standard. Monitoring delivery of SSH is necessary to demonstrate how the Plan supports ECC’s commissioning priorities and statutory duties under the Care Act 2014 and Children Act 1989. It also supports consistency with NPPF, paragraph 63, which requires Plans to establish need, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community including affordable housing (including Social Rent); families with children; looked after children, older people (including those who require retirement housing, housing with-care and care homes); and people with disabilities. The Monitoring Table does not include a specific indicator to track the delivery of Supported and Specialist Housing (SSH), as raised in ECC’s Regulation 18 response. Reference should be made to Policy Hou4 rather than Hou5 – Specialist Housing Requirements. While the framework refers to “annual specific housing needs completions.” this															Food Takeaway Applications refused in accordance with Policy TC5

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											terminology is not sufficiently clear to ensure effective monitoring of SSH delivery. ECC notes that this may be intended to capture SSH, but the wording does not explicitly reflect the range of accommodation types covered under Policy Hou4. The Plan does not currently include monitoring indicators for Policy Hou4, Criteria 2a to track the annual delivery of specialist housing by type and tenure of retirement sheltered homes. Monitoring delivery of SSH is necessary to demonstrate how the Plan supports ECC’s commissioning priorities and statutory duties under the Care Act 2014 and Children Act 1989. It also supports consistency with NPPF, paragraph 63, which requires Plans to establish need, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community including affordable housing (including Social Rent); families with children; looked after children, older people (including those who require retirement housing, housing with-care and care homes); and people with disabilities. The Monitoring Table does not include a specific									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											indicator to track the delivery of Supported and Specialist Housing (SSH), as raised in ECC’s Regulation 18 response. Reference should be made to Policy Hou4 rather than Hou5 – Specialist Housing Requirements While the framework refers to “annual specific housing needs completions,” this terminology is not sufficiently clear to ensure effective monitoring of SSH delivery. ECC notes that this may be intended to capture SSH, but the wording does not explicitly reflect the range of accommodation types covered under Policy Hou4. The indicator for Criteria 2b should reflect the required ECC amendment to Policy Hou4, Criteria 2b to reference `nursing care beds’ rather than `extra care beds’, which is consistent with national policy and ECC’s statutory duties. The Plan does not currently include monitoring indicators for Policy Hou4, Criteria 2b to track the annual delivery of specialist housing by type and tenure of residential care beds and nursing care beds. Monitoring delivery of SSH is necessary to demonstrate how the Plan supports ECC’s commissioning priorities and statutory								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
										duties under the Care Act 2014 and Children Act 1989. It also supports consistency with NPPF, paragraph 63, which requires Plans to establish need, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community including affordable housing (including Social Rent); families with children; looked after children, older people (including those who require retirement housing, housing with-care and care homes); and people with disabilities. ECC recommend including a monitoring indicator for Policy TC5 under Objective 19 which seeks to secure health and wellbeing outcomes. Castle Point Plan Objective 19: Secure improved health and wellbeing outcomes for residents enabling more active and healthier lifestyles, creating healthy living environments and reducing health inequalities								
1 0 1 3 - 0 0 0 6	Organisati on	Tes sa	Sau nder s	Angl ian Wat er Serv ices Ltd	Yes	Cha pte r 9	Yes		Yes	NOTE Consistency issue: Anglian Water recognises there are a number of redevelopment and regeneration opportunities within the town, at various sites. Some of the site allocation policies (Policy B3, B5, B6) includes the requirement that "the development proposal is compliant with all other relevant policies of this	Consistency issue between policies in relation as to whether a surface water drainage strategy should be required or a clause requiring "development proposals to be compliant with all other relevant policies of this Plan".	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	NOTE Consistency issue: Anglian Water recognises there are a number of redevelopment and regeneration opportunities within the town, at various sites. Some of the site allocation policies (Policy B3, B5, B6) includes the requirement that	NPPF paragraph 16 states that Plans should avoid unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area. Policies should not be read in	Modifica tion to policies B5 and B6 Remove sentenc e 'The proposa l is compla nt with all other

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											Plan"; however, none of the other site allocations for Benfleet include this requirement. We question whether all allocation policies require this criterion to ensure that the plan is read as a whole, or whether specific policy requirements such as the submission of a surface water drainage strategy should be specifically included? Similarly, the supporting text (paragraph 9.30) Policy B8 Manor Trading Estate references the inclusion of urban greening and introduction of sustainable drainage, but the policy includes no such requirement. The SFRA Level 2 recommendations stated that for all proposed development sites "peak surface water runoff rate from the development must be as close as reasonable practicable to the greenfield runoff rate...[and] Development proposals must demonstrate that the surface water will be managed and discharged from the site in accordance with the drainage hierarchy." This would suggest that either all the policies require the submission of a surface water drainage strategy that demonstrates that peak surface water runoff rates are no greater than						"the development proposal is compliant with all other relevant policies of this Plan"; however, none of the other site allocations for Benfleet include this requirement. We question whether all allocation policies require this criterion to ensure that the plan is read as a whole, or whether specific policy requirements such as the submission of a surface water drainage strategy should be specifically included? Similarly, the supporting text (paragraph 9.30) Policy B8 Manor Trading Estate references the inclusion of urban greening and introduction of sustainable drainage, but the policy includes no such requirement.The SFRA Level 2 recommendations stated that for all proposed development sites "peak surface water runoff rate from the	isolation, and the Castle Point Plan is to be read as a whole.	relevant policies of this Plan' Note the similar sentence in Policy B3 is retained since it specifically also refers to another policy (B2).

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											equivalent greenfield run-off rates and the discharge of the surface water should be managed in accordance with the drainage hierarchy OR are consistent with the requirements of Policy SD3.						development must be as close as reasonable practicable to the greenfield runoff rate...[and] Development proposals must demonstrate that the surface water will be managed and discharged from the site in accordance with the drainage hierarchy." This would suggest that either all the policies require the submission of a surface water drainage strategy that demonstrates that peak surface water runoff rates are no greater than equivalent greenfield run-off rates and the discharge of the surface water should be managed in accordance with the drainage hierarchy OR are consistent with the requirements of Policy SD3.		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 0 0 0 - 0 0 0 6	Agent	Sam	Holli ngw orth	Rain ier Dev elop men ts c/o Cere s Prop erty	Yes	Con clus ion	No		No		7.1 The DLP in its current form is evidently unsound. 7.2 Its approach to addressing housing need is contrary to the NPPF, and how national policy requires Councils to plan to meet their local requirements. Neither the proposed approach to meeting housing needs, nor the process of considering options in relation to the issue, appear to have given due consideration to the acute and current affordable housing shortage in the Borough. 7.3 The DLP's failings in this regard are rendered even more problematic by its proposal to delay delivering homes until towards the end of the plan period, with the proposed shortfall in the early years particularly pronounced. The negative social effects of putting off the provision of homes exacerbated by this delay, given that the vast majority of the Borough's projected affordable housing need is one that currently exists, would be very significant. 7.4 Not only is the approach to meeting housing needs fundamentally flawed in quantitative terms, but the spatial approach is considered neither justified nor consistent with national policy. 7.5 The bulk of the new dwellings proposed are		Not An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed	Yes - See atta ch me nts	B - upd ate d atta ch me nts	Considers the plan is unsound. Not meeting housing needs Release Green Belt sites Concern over the SA	Comments noted. These matters have been addressed specifically in each of the policy specific comments	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											being directed to an area subject to significant constraints and potentially one of the least sustainable parts of the Borough. Indeed, the deliverability of sites proposed to accommodate a significant proportion of the total number of new homes the DLP’s proposes appears highly suspect, particularly at the densities on which the DLP relies. The approach is neither sustainable nor effective. 7.6 Additionally, the site selection process is unsound. 7.7 There are sites that are sustainable and deliverable to provide new homes in the early years of the plan period, but which have been unduly rejected. This appears to have been the result of a combination of a misapplication of the NPPF’s Green Belt policies, and a failure to properly consider available evidence (including through the SA) of sites’ suitability to accommodate development. This has included the failure to properly identify grey belt land, including deliverable grey belt sites; or to consider non-grey belt, Green Belt land, if insufficient alternatives to meet development needs are available. 7.8 The SA of the DLP, should be a useful tool to help ensure that the DLP is									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											justified and will achieve sustainable development. However, there are substantial flaws in the SA of the DLP. These include failure to properly consider various effects (in particular social effects), failure to consider options on an evidential and objective basis, and a process that appears heavily and unjustifiably skewed towards favouring options which limit development. 7.9 .Not only are such defects in the SA a soundness matter, but the DLP’s compliance with the SEA Regulations is also of concern, given the extent and nature of the issues with the SA. 7.10 Separately, it is far from clear from the evidence available whether the preparation of the DLP has met the Duty to Cooperate. There is certainly little evidence that work undertaken to meet the Duty to Cooperate have been effective. Most notably, there is a lack of evidence that the Council has had any meaningful engagement with other Authorities within the housing market area regarding the potential for these neighbours to address the DLP’s shortfall in housing provision. 7.11 Our representations on a Local Plan at this stage would usually seek to									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											suggest remedies for the defects they identify. However, such is the extent and nature of the flaws with the DLP, we suggest that it will be very challenging for the Council to address these without fundamental changes. We suspect it will be necessary for the Council to revisit earlier stages in the plan-making process, and prepare a new Regulation 18 iteration of its Local Plan – one which properly considers options which are genuinely capable of forming a sound Local Plan that complies with national policy; and which is supported by robust evidence, including an SA which meets the requirements of the SEA Regulations.								
1 0 8 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Vic tori a	Sulli van		Yes	Con sult atio n	No	I understand that a consultation has to be robust and relevant evidence and documentation provided, but the 230 page document, and overly complicated form (this form) are too complex for the average person, this includes the fact that you are asking people to reference different parts of the consultation document. I think this is a construct to make it too difficult so people do not bother to object. How is the average person	No	Positively prepared	I understand that a consultation has to be robust and relevant evidence and documentation provided, but the 230 page document, and overly complicated form (this form) are too complex for the average person, this includes the fact that you are asking people to reference different parts of the consultation document. I think this is a construct to make it too difficult so people do not bother to object. How is the average person to	I understand that a consultation has to be robust and relevant evidence and documentation provided, but the 230 page document, and overly complicated form (this form) are too complex for the average person, this includes the fact that you are asking people to reference different parts of the consultation document. I think this is a construct to make it too difficult so people do not bother to object. How is the average person	No	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	Consultation too long to detract responses	A summary document was also provided but it is a legal requirement to consult on the whole document.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								to know if the consultation is sound or legally compliant?			know if the consultation is sound or legally compliant?	to know if the consultation is sound or legally compliant?							
0282-0032	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	D1	Not Stated		No	Effective	ECC consider objective o and the reasoned justification do not fully reflect the principles of inclusive design as set out in NPPF paragraph 135f, which requires planning policies to ensure developments are inclusive, accessible, and promote health and wellbeing. Policy D1 does not currently reference these inclusive design principles or the needs of people who require Specialist Supported Housing, including extra care housing, supported living, wheelchair-accessible homes, and other forms of accommodation for people with physical, sensory, cognitive, and mental health needs. The suggested amendment will enable the creation of inclusive communities, recognising that people with care and support needs may live in general housing and participate in wider community life. ECC seek an additional criteria requiring development to incorporate multifunctional green and blue infrastructure into the design process from the outset rather than it being an optional requirement.	ECC require an additional Criteria to read: Incorporate multifunctional Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) into the design to enhance biodiversity, support climate resilience, and improve the quality and connectivity of open spaces ECC recommend amendments to paragraph 16.28 to: • refer to dementia-inclusive communities, in line with current terminology and best practice; • refer to enabling people to age well and in place as a core principle of inclusive design. • reflect the needs of people with a range of support needs, including those with cognitive, sensory, mental health, and physical disabilities. • ensure inclusive design expectations include: • Dementia-inclusive features; • Wayfinding and sensory elements; • Adaptable layouts; • Accessible outdoor spaces; • Consideration of the needs of different cultures, genders, and disabilities	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	To make reference to design principles for Specialist Supported Housing within Policy D1 in order to create inclusive communities and that people with care and support may live in general housing and participate in wider community life.	Accepted reference to design principles for Specialist Supported Housing added.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											This is consistent with the NPPF, which incorporates green design principles by promoting sustainability (paragraph 16a), efficient use of land (paragraph 129), and biodiversity (paragraph 187a), mitigation and adaptation of climate change (paragraph 20d), the inclusion of trees in new developments (paragraph 136), and improved design quality (paragraph 137). This is further supported by recommendations and advice provided in the Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy Objectives to create high quality multifunctional GI and improve connectivity between people and wildlife. The ELNRS promotes the use of nature-based solutions, such as green roofs, urban greening, green corridors, and sustainable urban drainage systems in new development projects, to enhance biodiversity, mitigate climate change impacts and improve quality of life for residents. The Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide, published by Natural England, provides practical, evidence-based guidance on integrating nature-rich, climate-resilient green infrastructure into new developments and public spaces. It supports planners	ECC recommend `or’ replaces `and’ in Criteria 2a and b								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											and designers in delivering high-quality, multifunctional landscapes that benefit both people and nature. https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/GreenInfrastructure/downloads/Design Guide - Green Infrastructure Framework.pdf 3. Effective ECC welcomes the emphasis on accessible and inclusive design in paragraph 16.28, which is consistent with ECC's strategic priorities and the ECC Extra Care Design Guide (2023). However, some refinements are suggested to align with ECC's strategic priorities and align with NPPF, paragraph 135f which requires planning policies to promote inclusive, accessible development that support health and wellbeing.								
0738-0009	Organisation	Roy	Warren	Sport England	Yes	D1	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Consistent with national policy	In view the Local Plan's vision and strategic objectives relating to delivering health and wellbeing outcomes to enable more active and healthier lifestyles for residents, it is surprising that a design objective does not encourage development to be designed to encourage physical activity. While reference to Sport England's Active Design is made later in the plan in paragraph 16.34 of the reasoned	To address this, it is requested that an additional design objective is included in Policy D1 along the following lines: "Maximise opportunities for encouraging physical activity" It is also requested that the reasoned justification then provides a short explanation of the importance of designing developments to encourage physical activity	No	Not Answered		A	In view the Local Plan's vision and strategic objectives relating to delivering health and wellbeing outcomes to enable more active and healthier lifestyles for residents, it is surprising that a design objective does not encourage development to be designed to	Noted, see modifications	Modification to Policy D1 p. Maximise opportunities for encouraging physical activity. Modification to

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											justification to Policy D2, there is no specific objective in the design principles policy. As well as positively responding to the Local Plan's vision and objectives, the inclusion of an additional objective to address this matter would allow the policy to be consistent with paragraphs 96(c and 129(e of the NPPF as well as the Active Design guidance. An objection is therefore made to the Local Plan in its current form as it would not be considered to meet the 'positively prepared' or 'consistent with national policy' tests of soundness	and that Sport England's Active Design guidance is signposted to for detailed advice on how this can be achieved in practice.					encourage physical activity. While reference to Sport England's Active Design is made later in the plan in paragraph 16.34 of the reasoned justification to Policy D2, there is no specific objective in the design principles policy. As well as positively responding to the Local Plan's vision and objectives, the inclusion of an additional objective to address this matter would allow the policy to be consistent with paragraphs 96(c and 129(e of the NPPF as well as the Active Design guidance. An objection is therefore made to the Local Plan in its current form as it would not be considered to meet the 'positively prepared' or 'consistent with national policy' tests of soundness. To address this, it is requested that an additional design objective is		paragrap h 16.28 Develop ments have the potential to improve accessib ility and local permeab ility by making places that connect with each other and are easy to move through. This also encourages the use of active travel and encourages physical activity. Promoti ng legibility through develop ment helps to provide recognis able

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	included in Policy D1 along the following lines: “Maximise opportunities for encouraging physical activity” It is also requested that the reasoned justification then provides a short explanation of the importance of designing developments to encourage physical activity and that Sport England’s Active Design guidance is signposted to for detailed advice on how this can be achieved in practice.		routes, intersections and landmarks to help people find their way around; and make faster journeys . Sport England have also developed ‘ten principles to inform active design’ which provide guidance on how the design of environments can help people lead more physically active and healthy lives.

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1448-0001	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular Architecture	Not Stated	D1	Not Stated	This consultation feedback submission has been produced by Mr. David Richard Barton, also known as Community Campaigner David Barton who is promoting both the existing Built Historic Environment and Traditional Vernacular Architecture (TVA)/ Traditional Architecture (TA) as a key feature across UK and Ireland-wide Local Authorities and associated Planning Departments at all tiers of Local, Regional and Central Government. This universal consultation therefore acts as an official Representation at all and any stage of official area UK Planning Consultations- Preliminary Scoping Documents, Named Stages of the Local Plan, Conservation Area Appraisals and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), primarily regarding Design Codes. Representations are being made by Mr. Barton as part of his ongoing work to champion the key stakeholders at various key areas old and new with a view to supporting their economic growth through the merits of High-Quality style Conservation with the hope of encouraging wider constructive and restorative support through positive and constructive working.	Not Stated		SECTION 1: Design Codes:- 1. Design Codes based on TVA should be utilised in preference to Design Guides 2. LAs should establish recurring partnerships with key Consultation Bodies, such as Create Streets and The King's Foundation, etc who specialise in getting through to a huge swathe of grassroots members of the public with tried and tested previous experience in Local Plans, such as Lichfield, etc. 3. Non-demolition of historic buildings prior to the 1950s must be made policy or adhered to as part of LCC's commitment to combatting the Climate Crisis through sequestering carbon in its Old Builds. 4. LAs should adopt a Local List of Valued Buildings (Non-designated Heritage Assets), which have been a Government requirement since the policy introduction through the NPPF in 2012. Historic England produced a guide to help Councils in May 2012. Bristol produced an exemplar list in 2015, which is well worth reviewing. 5. Existing Action Plan if present for Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets needs identifying and/ or establishing (I may support this if invited). 6. Option for people to provide feedback even if out of time for additional		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Emphasises prioritising TVA design codes over guides, building recurring partnerships with consultation bodies, and preventing demolition of pre-1950s buildings to support climate goals. Calls for adoption of local lists of valued non-designated heritage assets, identification of existing action plans, and more flexible consultation processes. Strong focus on retaining and restoring Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian architecture, requiring new builds to use historic styles and local materials. Encourages local suppliers, artisan skills, volunteer assemblies, and streamlined planning processes. Where mixed eras exist, the predominant historic style should be used.	Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								It is submitted that TVA should play a key part in any and all policy moving forwards on the grounds of conferring practical benefits be these periodic maintenance, their perceived support from the public, their invaluable contribution to achieving Climate Crisis Targets set local, nationally and internationally alongside their overall cost-effectiveness to key stakeholders alike in terms of Planning and sourcing of raw materials. *One primary document that should be considered with significance especially alongside my own representation is a written academic account of the actual practicalities associated with Traditional Architecture from a leading expert in their field.i.) Not only does this in-depth analysis provide an in-depth take on the widely assorted merits of this type of Architecture but it fully corroborates my case made across all sections typically found in one of the consultations highlighted above. Furthermore, my representations to date and contained herein this document are duly supported by the Founder and Director of The Institute for Traditional			documents, such as SPDs or at the discretion of Councils where feedback may be particularly assistive or lead to additional academic and architect guidance. Option for public publishing of feedback should be encouraged with the consultee’s consent to encourage wider consultation uptake moving forwards. 7. Era-style Buildings, especially rows of Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian architecture must be faithfully restored, retained and recreated to complement surrounding historic streets that may or may not be classed in official Conservation Areas preventing harsh contrast with newer built housing estates from the 1950s onwards. 8. Where demolition is proposed for 1950s style housing onwards- any new construction must be in the historic building style and local materials to ensure high carbon capacity, quality aesthetic and true blending of the interconnected conurbations of any one area, place or location. 9. Concerted efforts to identify and locate core suppliers for raw materials and specific heritage skills should encourage new uptake of these limited artisan craft skills by new								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Architectureii.) who has identified and recognised my own contribution(s) to communities up and down the Sefton Borough. This is an internationally acclaimed organisation which periodically works with other leading agencies and organisations to bring about effective positive change. Page 5 of 18 Outlined throughout Submission are responses to existing Consultations which set out why I consider amendments to existing Planning Policy documents are necessary to ensure the best possible outcomes. References to supporting documents are contained in the indented blue numbering. This Submission has been prepared for UK and Ireland-wide Local Authorities in the hope that it may serve as an umbrella representation by Mr. Barton. This does not prejudice his ability to also comment on live stages of any one Consultation, merely providing the ability to be put in touch directly with any one Local Authority in receipt of this Representation with the prospect of also taking part in any version(s) of Consultations begin ran by said Local Authorities. If there are future consultations, especially regarding Design Codes and			contractors locally based to support the local economy, provide employment, and reduce the cost of product and service in the long-term. 10. Volunteer labouring assemblies should be fully encouraged and supported identifying key individual an group skillsets that can be utilised to protect historic buildings or areas at risk with a view to supporting the construction of new authentic style housing (as and where appropriate) and the reconstruction of demolished Page 9 of 18 prized old buildings beloved by the community, such as community pubs, libraries and community centres. 11. Simplified streamlined Planning Process for key stakeholders either working to authentically restore buildings and/ or build new ones, such as observed with many civic buildings in Budapest Hungary and the Federal University Buildings in the US. 12. Where there have been evolving building styles over years, eg. Combination of one or more: Georgian, Edwardian and Victorian, the style that best promotes the area, ie. One that has the majority era structures left or capacity size requirements as examples should be utilised by house builders, especially where a								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								SPDs relating to this across both designated and non-designated heritage assets then it is hoped that these are duly provided to Community Campaigner David Barton. Mr. Barton has cited material references and sources from his previous Representation to the Bootle Area Action Plan Consultation (2021-2026) that align with his existing and ongoing points which he would like to raise in parallel with other Local Authorities. Where a more detailed discussion with leading sources, such as Architects and Academics may prove conducive with these Councils then Mr. Barton would be delighted to discuss this further. Community Campaigner David Barton: Community Campaigner David Barton is a Heritage Campaigner of over 11 years’ experience who has championed and led a number of successful campaigns to promote TVA in modern-day life. His dual mandate is to provide effective (alternative) use of historical buildings encompassing a full restoration alongside achieving the mainstream construction of new classical architecture on numerous economic, environmental and ecological grounds that align			streetscape may have been annihilated during the World Wars.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
								with existing policy set out by Central Government covering the UK and increasingly elsewhere across the world. Having worked with a wide array of residents, businesses and organisations in that time, which has included the full restoration of the Victorian Verandahs on Lord Street, Southport in tandem with the respective key stakeholders and other property owners to prevent demolition of Old Builds across Sefton, Mr. Barton is now hoping to make the process of utilising the built environment to its fullest potential a far simpler one that will enable Bootle to fully reach its maximum potential as a historic town. Page 6 of 18 Mr. Barton should like to credit and thank the leading professionals and organisations that continue to support his TVA endeavours including: 1) Mr. Francis Shaw- Shaw & Jagger Architects 2) The King’s Foundation 3) Create Streets 4) Francis Terry & Associates 5) The Institute for Traditional Architecture This Submission is supported by the following appendices: i) Appendix i): Academic Perspective on Traditional Architecture by Mr. Francis													

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Shaw of Shaw & Jagger Architects (PDF) ii) Appendix ii.) Written Endorsement from Mr. Joseph Jutras of The Institute of Traditional Architecture (PDF) 1. Appendix 1: Sefton Climate Emergency Strategy Climate Emergency Strategy 2. Appendix 2: Sefton 2023/2024 Climate Report modgov.sefton.gov.uk/documents/s124335/Climate+Emergency+Annual+Report+2023-2024+final.pdf 3. Francis Terry & Associates- The Secrets of Popular Architecture https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/secret-of-popular-architecture/ 4. Appendix 3: PAS Guide to better Sustainability Appraisal PAS Guide to better Sustainability Appraisal Local Government Association 5. Appendix 4: Sefton Council Annual Air Quality Report 2024 air-quality-status-report-2024.pdf 6. Francis Terry & Associates- Natural Architecture Discussion https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/natural-architecture/ 7. Francis Terry & Associates- Sustainable Architecture Discussion (VIDEO) https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/what-is-sustainable-architecture/ 8. Francis Terry &											

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								Associates- Can Beautiful Homes be built in a Factory? https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/beautiful-homes/ 9. Create Streets- Design Codes Explanation design codes 10. Create Streets- Bootle Christ Church Project Bootle with Safe Regen 11. The King’s Foundation- Officer’s Mess Design Guide Rutland (PDF) 12. Create Streets- Lichfield Design Guide- Lichfield 13. Create Streets- Chatham Design Guide- Chatham Page 7 of 18 14. Create Streets- Street Assessment Service Street Assessment - Create Streets 15. Create Communities Mapping Platform Create Communities mapping platform - Create Streets 16. The King’s Foundation- BIMBY Toolkit Puts the power in your hands to influence new buildings in your area. 17. Francis Terry & Associates- Poundbury Discussion https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/poundbury/ 18. Institute of Traditional Architecture- Urban Planning Urban Planning – Institute of Traditional Architecture 19. Heritage and the Economy Historic England 20. The Economic Value of											

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								the Heritage Sector Heritage Counts Historic England; 21. Investing in Heritage to Avoid Embodied Carbon Emissions Heritage Counts 22. Historic England; 23. The Embodied Carbon Emissions of Construction and Retrofit Materials for Traditional Buildings Historic England 24. InYourArea- Community Campaigner David Barton- Placemaking Principles 2021 'Placemaking' is key to the future for Southport claims campaigner 25. InYourArea- Community Campaigner David Barton- Role of Traditional Town 2021 The role of the traditional town 'key' to Southport's future 26. Living with Beauty Report Example 76, Page. 177 Living with beauty: report of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission 27. InYourArea- Community Campaigner David Barton- Green Action Plan 2021 Former Councillor proposes climate change plan 28. InYourArea- Community Campaigner David Barton- Hedgerow Planting Benefits 2021 Campaigner calls for more green spaces in Southport 29. Benefits of Greenery Planting- The Guardian 2010 https://www.theguardian.co											

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								m/environment/green-living-blog/2010/oct/14/carbon-footprint-house 30. Francis Terry & Associates- Glad to be Pastiche Discussion https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/glad-to-be-pastiche/ 31. Francis Terry & Associates- What is more important, Materials or Form? https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/rotonda-in-cheese/ 32. InYourArea- Community Campaigner David Barton-Lathom Hall Seaforth https://www.inyourarea.co.uk/news/restoration-of-seaforth-beatles-landmark-club-a-breakthrough-in-combatting-climate-crisis											
0282-0033	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	D1	Not Stated		Yes		ECC welcomes the references to sheltered and care accommodation in paragraph 16.21, which is consistent with ECC's strategic priorities and the ECC Extra Care Design Guide (2023). ECC support Criteria h which requires new development to provide and enhance existing and safe convenient pedestrian and cycle routes. Developers		Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containi	B	Multifunctional green and blue infrastructure should be designed into the development at the outset to ensure that principles of biodiversity improvements, climate change adaptation and wellbeing are successfully	Accepted Additional text added to incorporate multifunctional green and blue infrastructure into scheme designs Noted CPBC agrees that	Incorporate multifunctional Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) into the design to enhance biodiversity,

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											should have regard to the Castle Point and Essex Wide LCWIP to seek the provision of any or contribute to and part of an identified route.				ng vari ous piec es of evid enc e		achieved. Welcomes references to sheltered and care accommodation within Policy D1 Provide further reference to inclusive and accessible development Supports the provision of more and enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes. Developers should have regard to the Castle Point Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and the Essex Wide LCWIP	development should endeavour be accessible to all abilities, but the justification text refers to the necessity of development to be permeable and accessible to allow public walking and cycling routes throughout. To add highly specific specialist accessibility design criteria would lose the active travel elements Noted	support climate resilience, and improve the quality and connectivity of open spaces Development proposals should have regard to the ECC Extra Care Design Guide principles to ensure opportunities for accessible and inclusive design are taken into account, enabling people to age well in place and reflecting the needs of

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			different cultures, genders and disabilities
0338-0008	Organisati on	Cat heri ne	Bick nell	NHS Mid and Sout h Esse x		D1- D9 Ach ievi ng Wel l Des igne d Pla ces	Yes	The ICB requested that parity of access to homes, spaces and means of transport for residents in all parts of the district should be addressed through the borough-wide design code. The supporting text to the Achieving Well Designed Places chapter, explains that the Castle Point deign Code has informed how policies in this chapter will be implemented. Policy D1 – Design Objectives sets out design criteria for new developments Policy D2 – Design on Larger Sites and within Premium Sustainability areas sets higher design requirements for specified areas Policy D3 – Master Planning sets out the requirements for master planning of sites allocated for development. Policy T1 – Transport Strategy includes commitments to securing developments in accessible locations with good access to services and integrated transport, including walking and cycling infrastructure and public transport;	Yes		The focus of policies is, understandably, on new developments. In relation to Canvey, place-based policies are included in the Plan; some allocate land for Mid and South Essex Integrated Care Board development including delivering enhancement to places, others seek to protect and improve existing assets. The ICB does not object to the proposed policies but asks whether the policies will be sufficient to deliver improvements for existing communities. The ICB asked that the design of new development should recognise and address the link between health outcomes and the wider determinants of health, including housing, transportation, access to healthy food options, social integration and the built environment. The ICB is satisfied that the Plan policies recognise the relevance of the wider determinants of health and should contribute to					A	The focus of policies is, understandably, on new developments. In relation to Canvey, place-based policies are included in the Plan; some allocate land for Mid and South Essex Integrated Care Board development including delivering enhancement to places, others seek to protect and improve existing assets. The ICB does not object to the proposed policies but asks whether the policies will be sufficient to deliver improvements for existing communities. The ICB asked that the design of new development should recognise and address the link between health outcomes and the	Support noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								requiring new developments to be designed using active design principles; securing improvements to provide well connected walking and cycling routes and associated infrastructure.			improving population health and wellbeing.						wider determinants of health, including housing, transportation, access to healthy food options, social integration and the built environment. The ICB is satisfied that the Plan policies recognise the relevance of the wider determinants of health and should contribute to improving population health and wellbeing.		
0 2 8 2 - 0 0 3 4	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	D2	Not Sta ted		No	Effective	ECC agrees that a distance of 400m from a bus stop is a key benchmark representing a reasonable walking distance for people of all abilities to access public transport services. This standard is often used in policy and design guides to ensure that new developments and existing communities are well-served by bus networks, promoting active travel and sustainable transport use. ECC consider that a bus stop per se is not a good indicator of “premium sustainability” as they may be served by no buses or by irregular and/or infrequent bus services.	ECC require paragraph 16.34 is amended to specify what is regarded as a frequent service to warrant the premium sustainability measure. A frequent bus service is generally regarded as 4 buses or more serving the stop during the morning and evening peak (excluding school buses) and a good range of services at other times.	Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie d 8 addi tional app endi ces con taini ng vari ous piec es of evid enc e	B	Additional clarification around meeting the sustainability criteria of access to services this should be either 400m walking distance to a bus stop or 800 m of a town centre Agrees that walking distance of 400m to a bus stop is a key benchmark for sustainability but the frequency of the bus service should be defined within the justification text.	Accepted clarification made CPBC agree that for the sustainable criteria to be reached a sufficient provision of bus stop times during peak hours should be available from the bus stop.	2. Premium sustaina bility areas are defined as: a. Sites within 800m of a town centre or railway station; and or b. Sites within 400m of a bus stop with a regular bus service. These facilities

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			are largely located within town centres. A distance of 400m from a bus stop is a key benchmark representing a reasonable walking distance for people of all abilities to access public transport services. " The service should provide a good level of frequency in order to make reasonable journeys to work, school

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			and to access commu nity services.
0 3 4 3 - 0 0 0 6	Agent	Ben	Wee dall	Glad man Dev elop men ts ltd		D2	No	Gladman support the Council's proposed approach to seeking higher density in areas in appropriate locations. It is important to optimise density, whilst having regard to local character and appearances, provide communal and public amenity multi-functional spaces, enhance permeability and improve access to services in the local area by well connected active and sustainable modes and to be of exemplary design, contributing to the evolution of local character. Gladman however do not support the Council's approach or consideration of 'premium sustainability'. Clearly there are locations where higher density is appropriate but such a definition of 'premium sustainability' is not supported or set in national policy. The Council should revisit this definition accordingly.	No							B	Support the Council's proposed approach to seeking higher density in areas in appropriate locations. But do not support the Council's approach or consideration of 'premium sustainability'. Clearly there are locations where higher density is appropriate but such a definition of 'premium sustainability' is not supported or set in national policy.	Noted	N
0 2 8 4 -	Organisati on	Em ma	Goo ding s	Bren two od Boro ugh	Not State d	D3	Yes	BBC supports CPBC's approach to require the use of Master Plans for allocated sites as these can be a valuable tool to ensure	Ye s						No	A	Supports policy of requiring master plans to be in place for allocated sites	Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0003				Council				development proposals. achieve the intentions of the relevant policies in the Local Plan. Additionally, the Council supports the inclusion of the requirement for Master Plans to be ‘approved by the Council’ in advance of planning application determination.											
0339-0004	Organisation	Sarah	Bowernan	Essex and Suffolk Water		D3	Yes	We are fully committed to supporting economic growth across the region and in the Borough of Castle Point and continue to invest in infrastructure enhancements to improve water distribution. However, it is important to note that, unlike domestic supplies, we do not have the same statutory obligation to provide water for non-domestic purposes and may be unable to immediately do so if the new water requirement is greater than the residual capacity in our network. We therefore have a particular interest in proposed strategic employment and economic development within your administrative area so that we can plan timely investment to increase capacity should it be needed. Policy B8 Manor Trading Estate and Policy C4 West Canvey explain that the regeneration and renewal of their respective areas will be carried out through a master plan approach. Policy E1	Yes		We note that both sites are intended to come forward later in the Plan period, and it is imperative to work collaboratively regarding the anticipated timing and phasing of the development and for us to fully understand the nature of the development. Again, we strongly encourage the submission of pre-planning enquiries to Essex and Suffolk Water (ESW) so we can ascertain the water supply needs, and plan and deliver in a timely manner any necessary infrastructure that may be needed. We also understand that, in the early stages of the Plan period, industrial use displaced by the redevelopment of sites for residential or town center purposes may be relocated to designated employment areas. Considering this, we request to be consulted at the earliest opportunity so that we can assess any associated infrastructure requirements in a timely manner.				A	We are fully committed to supporting economic growth across the region and in the Borough of Castle Point and continue to invest in infrastructure enhancements to improve water distribution. However, it is important to note that, unlike domestic supplies, we do not have the same statutory obligation to provide water for non-domestic purposes and may be unable to immediately do so if the new water requirement is greater than the residual capacity in our network. We therefore have a particular interest in proposed strategic employment and economic development within your administrative	Throughout the Castle Point Plan, the need to collaborate with a range of stakeholders to ensure delivery of development is highlighted. Paragraph 16.38 identifies that through the master plan process, infrastructure providers will be engaged, however it is agreed this could be clarified further through Policy D3. Policy D3 - Master Planning 1. Where this Plan requires the use of	Y - additional reference to infrastructure providers , as set out in the Schedule of Modds,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Development on Strategic Development Land states that the council will seek to provide and maintain classes B2 and B8 and another suitable Class B uses. We are keen to work collaboratively with the Local Authority's Economic Development and Planning teams to gain a detailed understanding of the nature of the proposed development. The development is expected to fall broadly within Use Classes B2, B8, and other Class B categories which can encompass a wide range of commercial activities with significantly varying water supply requirements. We are currently updating our policy position on large non-household developments requiring significant mains water for non-domestic use including but not limited to data centres, giga factories and hydrogen production plants. However, we can confirm that we will not approve new mains water connections to data centres where the water will be used for open loop cooling systems as we consider this to be an unsustainable use of water. However, we will consider supplies for closed loop cooling systems on a case-by-case basis through									area so that we can plan timely investment to increase capacity should it be needed (Policies B8 and E1) We are keen to work collaboratively with the Local Authority's Economic Development and Planning teams to gain a detailed understanding of the nature of the proposed development. The development is expected to fall broadly within Use Classes B2, B8, and other Class B categories which can encompass a wide range of commercial activities with significantly varying water supply requirements. We are currently updating our policy position on large non-household developments requiring significant mains water for non-domestic use including but not limited to data centres, giga factories and hydrogen	Master Plans for allocated sites, these will be approved by the Council in advance of the determination of any planning application. Where sites are in multiple ownership this will ensure that any individual parcels will not prejudice the future development of other parts of the site, adjoining land, or frustrate the delivery of the site allocation or wider area. 2. In preparing the Master Plan, the Council requires the applicant to demonstrate how they have engaged with and sought the views of relevant landowner(s), key stakeholders, infrastructure	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								our pre-planning enquiry process.									production plants. However, we can confirm that we will not approve new mains water connections to data centres where the water will be used for open loop cooling systems as we consider this to be an unsustainable use of water. However, we will consider supplies for closed loop cooling systems on a case-by-case basis through our pre-planning enquiry process. We note that both sites are intended to come forward later in the Plan period, and it is imperative to work collaboratively regarding the anticipated timing and phasing of the development and for us to fully understand the nature of the development. Again, we strongly encourage the submission of pre-planning enquiries to Essex & Suffolk Water (ESW) so we	providers and the local community. Whilst Councils can encourage pre-application discussions, it is an optional, discretionary service and cannot be made a requirement.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	can ascertain the water supply needs, and plan and deliver in a timely manner any necessary infrastructure that may be needed. We also understand that, in the early stages of the Plan period, industrial use displaced by the redevelopment of sites for residential or town center purposes may be relocated to designated employment areas. Considering this, we request to be consulted at the earliest opportunity so that we can assess any associated infrastructure requirements in a timely manner.		
0 3 4 1 - 0 0 1 3	Organisati on	Jan et	Nutt al	Nat ural Eng alnd		D3	Yes	Paragraph 16.38 states that masterplans should reflect the policy requirements of the Local Plan. In line with Policy SP1 and the wider Plan vision, this should include the need for multifunctional green infrastructure. The masterplan offers an opportunity to outline how GI has been integrated into a scheme to create high-quality, sustainable places. It will also ensure that GI is considered from the outset	Ye s							A	Paragraph 16.38 states that masterplans should reflect the policy requirements of the Local Plan. In line with Policy SP1 and the wider Plan vision, this should include the need for multifunctional green	<u>Modifications</u> 16.38 The Council will work with those promoting development, the local communities and infrastructure providers to ensure	<u>Modifications</u> 16.38 The Council will work with those promoting development, the

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								as an important piece of infrastructure in new developments.									infrastructure. The masterplan offers an opportunity to outline how GI has been integrated into a scheme to create high-quality, sustainable places. It will also ensure that GI is considered from the outset as an important piece of infrastructure in new developments.	that Master Plans accurately reflect the vision and the policy requirements in this Plan but also local aspirations and preferences concerning layout, style, character and relationship to adjoining land uses. 16.39 In line with the wider plan vision, the masterplan offers an opportunity to outline how multifunctional green infrastructure has been integrated into a scheme to create high-quality,	local communities and infrastructure provides to ensure that Master Plans accurately reflect the vision and the policy requirements in this Plan but also local aspirations and preferences concerning layout, style, character and relationship to adjoining land uses.

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		sustainabl e places. It will also ensure that GI is considered from the outset as an important piece of infrastruct ure in new developme nts	16.39 In line with the wider plan vision, the master plan offers an opport unity to outline how multif unctio nal green infrast ructur e has been integr ated into a schem e to create high- quality , sustai nable places . It will also ensure that GI is

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			considered from the outset as an important piece of infrastructure in new developments
0 9 8 8 - 0 0 0 5	Agent			Pers imm on Ho mes Ltd c/o Peg asus Gro up	Yes	D3	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	5.1. Clear criteria need to be provided of when the Council would expect a masterplan to be provided, the detail that a masterplan would need to cover, and the approval process for a masterplan. This will provide certainty to both applicants and decision makers, and ensure there is no unnecessary delay to the approval of planning applications – having regard to the resources available at the Council as well.		Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Clear criteria of the detail needed for the masterplan and the approval process is needed	Officers will work closely with developers to ensure that the masterplan is detailed. Policy D3 explains what is required.	N
0 2 8 2 - 0 0 3 5	Organisation	Kevin	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	D4	Not Stated		Yes		ECC seek a typo is amended to read 'streams' in Criteria 2. ECC support the policy setting out a clear requirement for landscaping and planning condition requirements for management and maintenance plans	ECC require Criteria 2 is amended to read: Pre-existing natural features, including hedgerows, ponds, streams, ditches should be retained and incorporated within the design scheme layout as far as possible.	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional app	B	Typo. Amend to "streams"	Accepted and corrected	2. Pre-existing natural features, including hedgerows, ponds, streams,

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
															endices containing various pieces of evidence				ditches should be retained and incorporated within the design scheme layout as far as possible.
0282-0036	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	D4	Not Stated		No	Effective	ECC welcome that any tree planting should be required to consider the maintenance issues associated with street tree planting and the need to work with highways officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users consistent with NPPF, paragraph 136. ECC recommend Criteria 4 makes reference to the Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) network, as landscaping plays a key role in delivering and connecting GBI across developments and the wider area. This is consistent with the Green Infrastructure Framework Design Guide and supports delivery of local strategies like the ELNRS and South Essex GBI Strategy.	ECC require the reasoned justification makes reference to the need to consider the Essex Design Guide - Highways Technical Manual - planting in sight splays.ECC require an additional Criteria in 4 to read: Connectivity to the wider Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) network by enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and integrating nature-based solutions that promote climate resilience.	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Welcomes that maintenance issues are considered with the planting of trees. Reference should be made to the Essex Design Guide and Highways Technical Manual Planting in Sight Splays. Recommends reference is made to the GBI network in the design of landscape schemes Supports policy for setting planning conditions for management and maintenance of landscape schemes	Accepted and references added Accepted and references added Noted	3. The most appropriate tree should be planted within the development, compatible with highways standards having regard to the Essex Design Guide, Highways Technical Manual - Planting in Sight Splays

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			and the needs of different users 4 e. Connectivity to the wider Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) network by enhancing ecological connectivity, supporting biodiversity, and integrating nature-based solutions that promote climate resilience
0323-0007	Organisation	Michael	Atkins	Port of London Authority		D4											Policy D4 – Landscaping: As part of the reasoned justification (16.48) with regard to the public realm, it is considered that there must be	Mods proposed	New para after 16.48 Waterside developments should

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	appropriate wording included on the vital need for future waterside developments to provide appropriate riparian life saving equipment (such as grab chains, access ladders and life buoys) alongside riverside areas as recommended by the PLA's 'A safer Riverside Guidance' for development on and alongside the Tidal Thames (A Safer Riverside Port of London Authority). The PLA also considers that there is need for suicide prevention measures in appropriate locations (such as CCTV and signage with information to access support) to be provided as part of new development along the riverside. This is supported by the Drowning Prevention Strategy (2019) (https://www.pla.co.uk/Safety/Water-Safety/Water-Safety) produced by the Tidal Thames Water Safety Forum, which comprises a number of agencies		provide appropriate riparian life-saving and safety equipment) as recommended by the Port of London Authority 'A Safer Riverside Guidance' and the 'Drowning Prevention Strategy' (2019) produced by the Tidal Thames Water Safety Forum.

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	including the PLA, RNLI and emergency services.		
0823-00112	Organisation	Pat	Abbott	Environment Agency	Yes	D6	Yes		Yes		Where there are proposals for residential annexes to single storey properties within flood risk areas, there are opportunities to provide areas of refuge above flood levels where none currently exist with the host building. Without opportunities to better manage the residual risks of flooding, there is a likelihood that the consequences of a flood to people and property will be worse Flood risk is a function of likelihood/chance and impact/consequence, and without useful mitigations. It is likely that flood risk will increase on sites through exposing more people to the hazards of flooding if extension or annex developments are granted without addressing the increase in impact that a flood of a given likelihood could produce within the site. We would welcome an addition to the policy wording to identify that annexes and extensions to single storey properties located within areas of high flood risk (from rivers, the sea or	Where there are proposals for residential annexes to single storey properties within flood risk areas, there are opportunities to provide areas of refuge above flood levels where none currently exist with the host building. Without opportunities to better manage the residual risks of flooding, there is a likelihood that the consequences of a flood to people and property will be worse Flood risk is a function of likelihood/chance and impact/consequence, and without useful mitigations. It is likely that flood risk will increase on sites through exposing more people to the hazards of flooding if extension or annex developments are granted without addressing the increase in impact that a flood of a given likelihood could produce within the site. We would welcome an addition to the policy wording to identify that annexes and extensions to single storey properties located within areas of high flood risk (from rivers, the sea or from surface water) must provide a place	Not Answered	Not Answered		A	EA requested within their response to the Regulation 19 consultation that additional wording should be added with regards extensions to single storey dwellings in high-risk flood areas, as residents in these types of dwellings are highly vulnerable to flood risk. For such dwellings a place of safety/refuge above the assessed level of flooding from any source must be provided as part of the extension. The EA also requested that additional wording to be added for annexes or extensions in areas at risk of flooding, that flood resistance and resilience measures should be required as part of the design in order that the development could	Comments noted. Many extensions and annexes have permitted development rights and as such do not require planning permission and consequently the Local Plan has limited influence on these types of development. Please see modifications proposed.	1d. Flood Risk: The design of annex or extensions should include flood resistance and/or resilience measures to allow the development to be quickly brought back to use without significant refurbishment following a flood event. For single storey

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											from surface water) must provide a place of safety/refuge area for occupants that is above the assessed level of flooding from any source. For annex or extensions in areas at risk of flooding, flood resistance and resilience measures should be required as part of the design as specified in paragraph 181(b) of the NPPF so that, in the event of a flood, the development could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment.	of safety/refuge area for occupants that is above the assessed level of flooding from any source. For annex or extensions in areas at risk of flooding, flood resistance and resilience measures should be required as part of the design as specified in paragraph 181(b) of the NPPF so that, in the event of a flood, the development could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment.					be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment.		dwelling , a place of safety/r efuge above the asse ssed level of flooding from any source should be provide d whereve r possible .
0 2 8 4 - 0 0 0 4	Organisati on	Em ma	Goo ding s	Bren two od Boro ugh Cou ncil	Not State d	D9	Yes	BBC supports CPBC's approach for protecting and enhancing heritage assets in the borough and has no specific concerns over the soundness of this policy.	Ye s						No	A	Supports policy of protecting and enhancing heritage	Noted	N
0 3 3 3 - 0 0 0 4	Organisati on	An dre w	Mar sh	Hist oric Engl and		D9	Yes	We welcome the comprehensive approach taken in Policy D9 to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. The policy provides a clear framework for the consideration of both designated and non-designated heritage assets, and we are pleased to see reference to key supporting documents and management plans.	Ye s			While we consider the policy to be sound, we recommend that the wording is reviewed to replace terms such as "should" with "shall" or "must" where appropriate. This would help to reinforce the requirements and expectations for applicants and decision makers. For ease of access, we also suggest that hyperlinks to the relevant documents (such as the South Benfleet Conservation Area					We welcome the comprehensive approach taken in Policy D9 to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. The policy provides a clear framework for the consideration of both designated and non-designated heritage assets, and we are pleased to	Mods to Policy D9 agreed as set out in the Scghedule of Mods and Statement of Common Ground. Hyperlinks added and replacements of 'should' with 'Shall/Must'.	Yes - Mods to Policy D9 agreed as set out in the Schedul e of Mods and Stateme nt of Commo

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												Management Plan, Florence Gardens Conservation Area Management Plan, and the South Benfleet Conservation Area Design Code) are included in the online version of the Plan. Finally, we recommend including a caveat to clarify that the lists of heritage assets appended to the Plan (Appendix H) are subject to change over time, for example as new non-designated heritage assets are identified or as designations are updated. This will ensure that the Plan remains flexible and up to date as further information becomes available.					see reference to key supporting documents and management plans. While we consider the policy to be sound, we recommend that the wording is reviewed to replace terms such as “should” with “shall” or “must” where appropriate. This would help to reinforce the requirements and expectations for applicants and decision makers. For ease of access, we also suggest that hyperlinks to the relevant documents (such as the South Benfleet Conservation Area Management Plan, Florence Gardens Conservation Area Management Plan, and the South Benfleet Conservation Area Design Code) are included in the online version of the Plan.		n Ground. Hyperlinks added and replacements of 'should' with 'Shall/Must'.

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 4 4 8 - 0 0 0 2	Organisati on	Dav id	Bart on	Trad ition al Vern acul ar Arch itect ure	Not State d	D9	Not Sta ted		No t Sta ted		SECTION 2: Designated & Non-Designated Heritage Assets: 1. Enhancement of Historic Areas to remove modern street furniture with the integration of classical style timepieces should be encouraged and pursued wherever possible with clear preferred guides set out for each part of the City. 2. Enhancement of Setting with funding grants and financial incentives from all tiers of Government for Private Investors especially those contributing actively towards achieving Net Zero through Embodied Energy/ Carbon Capacity rich measures, i.e. Retention of Old Builds. 3. Archive Pooling of invaluable source material, such as Historic Photographs, Oil Paintings, such as “Memory Lane” featured on InYourArea Magazine to enrich existing material archives. 4. New officialising of Non-Designated Heritage Assets must be actively supported even if informed by the (wider) community thereby providing some possibility of removing these from risk of demolition. 5. Incentives must be provided to those dependable sincere third party investors that take on, maintain and protect said sites against their		Not Sta ted	Not Stat ed	Not Stat ed		Advocates removal of modern street furniture, provision of grants and incentives for investors retaining old builds, pooling archives, and supporting community recognition of non-designated assets. Recommends incentives for third-party investors, remote engagement with property owners, defining character areas using authentic blueprints, conserving industry at historic complexes, and outreach to owners demolishing worship or landmark buildings. Suggests mandatory collaboration through community champions, reconstruction programmes, expanded risk checklists, and tailored funding packages. For conservation areas, calls for simplified listed building consent, enhanced historic appeal,	Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											annihilation from the streetscape with rescue-packages actively promoted and supported once again with a trusted Directory creating goodwill amongst the local community. 6. Opportunity to meet or correspond on Zoom Conference Call regarding key areas, buildings and places at risk where key stakeholders, such as property owners may be better placed to engage in positive and constructive discussion through third parties, such as myself and a trusted panel of experts in their fields and sectors who could enable these people and organisations to maximise their civic heritage, whilst proactively striving to protect more historic buildings from decline and/ or demolition where a strategy package for raising the revenue to do this could be arranged and facilitated. 7. Defining Character Areas-zoning symmetrical parallel construction recommended where distinctive individualised properties remain as checked against authentic archive blueprints. This will ensure high-quality housing for everyone reducing the Page 10 of 18 societal divides between misperceived “good areas” where affluent people reside						incentives for lost decorative features, support for replica durable materials, prevention of misuse of modern designs, directories of TVA architects, establishment of new conservation areas, support for Blue Plaques, discretionary rate relief, and retention or reproduction of historic street furniture. On historic buildings, proposes creation of designated/non-designated lists, clearance of vegetation along railways, grant funding for exception areas, guidance on street furniture, rebuilding long-lost buildings on vacant sites, provision of archive blueprints, discretionary tax reductions, authentic suburban styles as compromise, reinstatement of fascia details, collaboration with foundries, banning carbuncle extensions, and financial support for		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											in historical style properties and less advantaged reside in contemporary ones. 8. Industry should be conserved at former industrial complexes, such as Economic Docks with equivalent sites offering modern-day uses, alongside traditional uses such as export and import of raw materials at places such as Docks and Port encompassing: ICT sector, Green Research & Development, etc. 9. Every effort must be made to reach out to Property Owners, especially Housebuilders that are pursuing demolition of long-beloved buildings, especially those with demonstrable evidence of Holy Worship. 10. Every effort must be made to reach out to Property Owners, especially Housebuilders that are pursuing demolition of landmark buildings, especially those with key links to an area’s founding or history locally. 11. All Powers to monitor, collaborate with existing and/ or new property owners to conserve these buildings should become mandatory with appointed Community Champions for Civic Heritage that area direct link between Local Authorities and said wider key stakeholders to prevent demolition of structures that						traditional vernacular restoration. For vernacular architecture, urges directories of trusted contractors, encouragement of TVA solid wall construction, simplified consent forms, heritage skills programmes, in-keeping extensions, adoption of historic layouts for new estates, timeless designs for housing expansion, infrastructure planning to avoid congestion, reinstatement of historic layouts, prevention of modern structures dividing communities, and protection of façades.		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											may be at risk of destruction from vandalism, urban exploration and demolition. 12. Reconstruction Programme harnessing existing limited crafts people’s skillsets to be used as a fundraising vehicle to bring back buildings that may have been demolished to dissuade future demolition as a choice by property owners and by means of expanding these otherwise lost skillsets that are at live risk of becoming extinct from the UK. 13. Checklist of buildings at high risk must be expanded beyond the existing groups and organisations that are saturated with high caseloads, such as SAVE Britain’s Heritage, etc so that dialogue channels can be created and fostered between Community Champions for Civic Heritage. 14. Bespoke-tailored funding packages for Properties at Risk of decline or demolition should be integrated with Local, Regional and Central Government-funding as a means of regional economic output through the return on investment that may support other key grant funding capital infrastructure projects, such as transportation and drainage improvements. SECTION 3: Conservation Areas:-								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											1. Alterations for Listed Building Consent must be simplified with additional streamlined testing methodologies, such as proof of legitimate third party support, such as correspondence chains between applicant and Groups, such as The Victorian Society that can assist LAs complete workload much sooner allowing more attention for challenging cases, such as Non-Designated Heritage Assets at live or upcoming risk of demolition by Housebuilders, etc. 2. Highways & Street Furniture should be duly supported across the whole of an area to enhance its historic appeal to the commercial community as much to its indigenous community; as this is supported greatly in equivalent Public Realm Strategy SPDs- where any and all guidance and support must and should be provided, with key at risk projects being an exceptional anecdote that may be cited in future documents or versions of this and other consultations to stimulate economic construction and restoration across other designated Conservation Areas, etc or otherwise. 3. Provide incentives for the return of lost adornments								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											and decorative features, such as roof fixtures like Chimney Stacks once again with an approved contractor directory to make Old Builds practical to own, live and work in the 2020s onwards. If a Directory cannot be provided then specific wording and guides on esoteric restoration and new traditional building styles that would see modern-day use of decorative features must be provided by the Local Council. 4. Permissions for authentic replica and more durable materials, such as reproduction sash windows must be supported to prevent exorbitant high costs through procuring these, limited longevity and economic climates being unstable. This must be assessed on a case by case basis. 5. No more deliberate manipulation and selective misinterpretation of using contemporary modern designs using old-style fabric raw materials, such as stone cladding for new housing where the design and shape clearly undermine the concept of blending within or around a Conservation Area. 6. Compendium of approved and recognised TVA Architects based across the UK with a view to supporting the training in time of more Northern counterparts to								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											reduce cost associated with travel expenses, etc. This will actively reduce the level of demolition applications countering the purpose of this SPD and other live Policy. If a Directory cannot be provided then specific wording and guides on esoteric restoration and new traditional building styles that would see modern-day use of decorative features must be provided by the Local Council. 7. New Conservation Areas should be established covering areas of surviving built historic environment to positively reverse fascia changes to more modern ones. 8. Blue Plaques should be fully supported across as many different Conurbations, especially if Applicants reach out for endorsements. Page 12 of 18 9. Discretionary Rate Relief should be provided to those proactively support LAs with conserving their respective Conservation Areas through their own resources, skillsets and time as an incentive to others to work alongside the Council positively and constructively. 10. Where long-lost prized buildings are reconstructed whether based in a Conservation Area or not this should confer discretionary									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											financial support, e.g. Rate Relief for the length of time taken to produce this outcome acknowledging the embodied carbon now contributing positively towards the LA's Climate Change Action Plan Targets. 11. Retention of historic street furniture, such as Lamp Posts adorning high streets or Promenade style streetscapes with collaborate fundraising models utilised from key stakeholders, such as property owners, undisclosed third party investors, Residents' Groups, etc. 12. Retention of historic street furniture, such as Lamp Posts adorning high streets or Promenade style streetscapes with authentic identical reproductions permitted where all options to secure finance have been fully exhausted and/or the existing streetscape is at imminent risk of receiving contemporary replacement street furniture on health and safety grounds, eg. Lap Posts. SECTION 5: Historic Buildings:- 1. Create a Designated AND a Non-Designated Heritage Asset List, such as AHV whereby existing buildings and those that may yet return can be logged and recorded to combat the Climate Crisis whilst making									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											heritage work for LAs in modern day with attractive locations timeless for everyone to appreciate enhancing the investor appeal, all-round interest and acknowledging the industrial pioneering legacy of the City. 2. Clearance of vegetation along the Railway Lines alongside other equivalent parts of the Line to eradicate the perceived neglected aesthetic. 3. Exception Areas, such as those at risk or recently restored have the real potential for wider grant funding for ambitious projects out of the realm necessarily of undisclosed third party investors supporting Property Owners, therefore all and any support in reaching these person(s) will greatly contribute to all possible tangible success in the interim period. 4. Providing key guidance, such as agreed in-keeping historic street furniture, such as Cast Iron Lamp Posts, Bins, Planters approved upon inspection of historic photographs, agreed installation and where appropriate maintenance by the LA will ensure the iterative success of this transferring to other Conservation Areas, etc. 5. Scheme to rebuild and reconstruct long-lost buildings. prioritising vacant								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											sites that could adapt some mixed use with residential accommodation and commercial application thereby supporting Climate Action, creating employment and recordable success through placing of necessary economic drivers, such as offices for Technology Sector if original use cannot be sourced in sufficient time simultaneously meeting housing targets. 6. Archive Blueprints for historic conurbations that have suffered architecturally over time through building conversions, demolitions, etc should be provided to key stakeholders, if necessary with a printing charge available for official spiral hard copy version to view detailed historic plans covering layouts, etc. 7. Those people and organisations that have either/ both maintained their properties well over the years or may wish to provide additional support to others, such as restorative support, archive blueprint guidance, etc should be eligible for discretionary reductions by the Council across various property taxes where they may be suffering hardship or through personal circumstances. 8. “Newer” style housing with true authentic rhythm, such as Suburban style faux Tudor fascia frontages with								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
											red clay tile pitched roofs and terracotta design windows (tile hung walls) are a good compromise whereupon finance and scheduling may otherwise adversely impact on housing settlements. 9. Fascia Frontage details should be reinstated whether in a Conservation Area or not, especially where approval has been granted to rebuild an entire house using breeze block to produce a stereotypical black, white and grey dwelling out of place. Page 15 of 18 10. LAs should work closely with Foundries to procure raw materials and building services in the event of harnessing their own Contractor Firm(s) in-house that could work cross-authority to make net savings whilst ensuring particular new housing neighbourhoods conform to an appropriate style. 11. Modern “Carbuncle” extensions should not be permitted at any one area- instead an authentic style addition may be used to retain blending. 12. Discretionary financial support packages to assist House Builders choosing the traditional vernacular route should be considered and utilised where it can be proven that this third party will restore the historic										

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											streetscape yet making it applicable or modern day requirements- residential or commercial. This may be especially so where they are able to help others prevent the demolition of a prized Old Build built before the 1950s. SECTION 6: Traditional Vernacular Architecture:- 1. Provide a directory of approved and trusted Conservation Specialist Contractors- this will be key for repairs and maintenance reducing costs for all parties, expediting the physical process of regeneration and smoothen planning work schedules so that finer detail may be considered on priority cases or those that may be at risk of consequential repair, such as Places of Worship and detached Buildings with flat roofs, etc at higher risk of damage than customary dwellings. 2. These same people should be readily contactable for new construction 3. Encourage smart building methods and use of TVA as meticulously explained in this SPD outlining “Breathing” Solid Wall Construction using older style materials thereby reducing maintenance cost which combined with the approved contractor directory will further drive								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											down costs, time and effort for everyone. 4. Alterations- must introduce a simplified listed building consent form and application process that is streamlined encouraging better maintenance of Old Builds and reducing the rising propensity of builders to allow buildings to deteriorate, such as the Historic Pub that had to be rebuilt in Kilburn, London post 2015. 5. Provide specialist Heritage Arts & Craft Skills Programmes that anyone can learn and use so that these high cost tasks can eventually stabilise in price making them more affordable and available to those that don't have the time to do this themselves or may be risk averse even. 6. Extensions- there must be a proactive emphasis on in-keeping structural fabric to prevent future errors, such as the Municipal Building depicted in the SPD being replicated again thereby harming the Conservation value. 7. New Housing Estates should adopt historical archival blueprints, ie. A Georgian, Victorian or Edwardian layout with the likeliest period architecture utilised where this area remained greenbelt until the 1950s. Page 16 of 18								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											8. Area Expansion of housing must revert to traditional timeless designs that confer many practical advantages over modern styles that are harder to maintain are timeless with regard to dating and ensure a more evenly distributed community atmosphere in the long-term future. 9. Infrastructure should be appropriately considered for existing and new areas so that no one area is at risk of becoming congested through traffic for a particular commodity, such as Schools, Doctor Practice, Dental Practice, etc. 10. Site Layouts should complement the historic layout with a view to Post 1950s contemporary Architecture out of place being one day demolished to reinstate Long-lost beloved buildings from before the World Wars that could blossom economically today. 11. Building Form shouldn't permit for dated modern structures that delineate and essentially divide communities between the old and new parts of any one location. 12. Façade Design mustn't be compromised for contemporary architecture, especially in view of coveted Heritage Status for any one area being at risk of being								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											lost if said contemporary architecture is pursued.								
0 3 6 0 - 0 0 0 9	Organisati on	Mar len e	Curt is	Briti sh Hors e Soci ety		DH 1			No		Re No. 4 of "projects improving managed walking and cycling connections across the wider area will be supported", here again if horse riders are omitted from this Green Space Connectivity the Local Plan is considered to be unsound.				See atta ch me nt	B	Re No. 4 of "projects improving managed walking and cycling connections across the wider area will be supported", here again if horse riders are omitted from this Green Space Connectivity the Local Plan is considered to be unsound.	A modification to policy DH1 point 4 is agreed to ensure the long history of equine activity in the area is protected.	Y

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0333-0003	Organisation	Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		DH1	Yes	We welcome criterion 1, which acknowledges the historic pattern of irregular small fields and ancient woodland. These features make a valuable contribution to the area's historic environment and sense of place. We therefore particularly support the requirement for this landscape character to be protected and enhanced.	Yes								We welcome criterion 1, which acknowledges the historic pattern of irregular small fields and ancient woodland. These features make a valuable contribution to the area's historic environment and sense of place. We therefore particularly support the requirement for this landscape character to be protected and enhanced.	Support noted	N
0341-0012	Organisation	Janet	Nuttall	Natural England		DH1	Yes	We are pleased to see reference to 'projects to promote the continued improvement of the local wildlife sites and SSSIs (Garrold's Meadow and Great Wood and Dodd's Grove) and recovery of sections that are in an unfavourable condition'.	Yes							A	We are pleased to see reference to 'projects to promote the continued improvement of the local wildlife sites and SSSIs (Garrold's Meadow and Great Wood and Dodd's Grove) and recovery of sections that are in an unfavourable condition'.	Support noted	N
0794-0006	Individual	Daniel	Adams		Yes	DH1	Yes		Yes		Plan mentions "Introduce FURTHER cycle routes along New Road/Daws Heath Road.." - there are none at present! To allow for safe cycling between Daws Heath and Thundersley/Hadleigh, Daws Heath Road should have narrow on-road cycle lanes where no pavement and joint		Not Answered	Not Answered		A	Better cycle routes in Daws Heath	Policy T3 seeks to secure active travel improvements and Policy DH1 promotes connectivity within Daws Heath	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											cycle-pedestrian path where there is pavement.								
0937-0005	Individual	Jonathan	Pinnock		Yes	DH1	Yes		Yes				Not Answered	Not Answered		A	Supports Policy DH1	Support noted.	N
0947-0004	Agent	Liam	Ryder	Rosconn Group c/o CODE Development Planners Ltd	Yes	DH1	No	Within these representations CODE identify fundamental failings in CPBC's Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in relation to the appropriate consideration of reasonable alternatives. CODE is particularly concerned at the total absence of consideration for the reduced area of land east of Rayleigh Road, Thundersley (site GB13) from consideration within the SA, which is identified in other evidence base documents (including the Green Belt Assessment, July 2025) as potentially meeting the definition of Grey Belt (and thereby not being considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, subject to meeting the NPPF's golden rules). In addition to the substantial concerns regarding the SA, CODE has also identified concerns regarding the lack of clarity over CPBC's accordance	No	Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	In relation to policy DH1, CODE would question the need for the policy in addition to the Green Belt designation around Daws Heath itself. In addition, policy ENV1 (protecting and enhancing the landscape and landscape features) performs a similar function. CPBC should consider deleting the policy – three interlinking policies can create difficulty for applicants in navigating local planning policy context which would reduce the likelihood of proposals being found in accordance with the development plan.	DH1 - CPBC should consider deleting the policy – three interlinking policies can create difficulty for applicants in navigating local planning policy context which would reduce the likelihood of proposals being found in accordance with the development plan.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Questioning why DH1 is needed when the land is allocated as Green Belt and ENV1 performs a similar function, should be removed	Policy DH1 is considered necessary to improve the existing situation with regards to the recreational role of the area which will be protected and enhanced with opportunities for managed passive recreation, focussing on heath, wellbeing and educational value. Projects improving managed walking and cycling connections across the wider area will also be supported. It is important to acknowledge	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
								with the Duty to Cooperate. The Duty to Cooperate evidence section on the local plan website is limited to one statement of common ground (SOCG) between CPBC and Essex County Council (ECC) in relation to land north west of Thundersley, which is acknowledged within to not be a viable option for allocation in the current local plan (and nor was it appropriate for allocation in the previously withdrawn local plan). It is difficult to establish CPBC’s correspondence and cooperation with its neighbours regarding requests to accommodate some of CPBC’s need, particularly in light of the statements made within the Castle Point Plan, and across the evidence base, regarding perceived local constraints which (in CPBC’s view) excludes Green Belt sites from consideration for allocation. Indeed, paragraph 28 of the NPPF states, “In order to demonstrate effective and on-going joint working, strategic policy-making authorities should prepare and maintain one or more statements of common ground, documenting the cross-boundary matters being addressed and progress in cooperating to												the value to the environment of the land and does not conflict with ENV1.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
								address these.” The NPPF further clarifies that such statements of common ground should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. The publication of one statement of common ground which relates to a specific part of the borough, and which is not included in the local plan for consideration as an allocation is not sufficient to demonstrate appropriate co-operation with neighbouring authorities. It is noted within the officer’s report to Special Council (for the meeting on 23 July 2025) that “The key issue which is to be finalised is a final decision from adjoining and nearby councils on whether they can accept any of the unmet need from Castle Point (between 4,736 and 6,511 dwellings). This can only be completed once the Council has published its Regulation 19 draft Castle Point Plan and has specified the level of unmet need.” However, it is important to note paragraph 26 of the NPPF which stipulates, “Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making												

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary, and whether development needs that cannot be met wholly within a particular area could be met elsewhere.” The Duty to Cooperate is a gateway test for the soundness and legal compliance of a local plan. In light of the requirements of paragraph 26 of the NPPF, it is not acceptable to seek to satisfy the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate post-submission as joint working between strategic policy making authorities should have been undertaken throughout the preparation of the Castle Point Plan and cannot be applied retrospectively.											
1440-0002	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	DH 1	Yes		Yes			Please change 'fritillary' to Heath Fritillary butterflies in point 2 Please correct the typo 'heath' and alter to 'health' in point 4	No				Please change 'fritillary' to Heath Fritillary butterflies in point 2 Please correct the typo 'heath' and alter to 'health' in point 4	Agreed	Policy DH1 2. The Council will continue to support opportunities for restoration, enhance

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			ment and creation of habitats in the area, particularly priority habitats and habitats benefiting protected/priority species including heath fritillary butterflies, badgers and southern wood ants. 4. The area's recreational role will be protected and enhanced with opportunities for managed passive recreation, focusing

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			on health, wellbeing and education value.
0 9 9 2 - 0 0 0 5	Agent	Tim oth y	Man na	Hills ide Ente rpris es c/o WSP	Yes	DH 2	Yes		No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Policy DH2 sets out that development will be approved where it does not result in the coalescence of settlements through a reduction in openness and space or the creation of urbanising effects between settlements. The Castle Point Borough Green Belt Review (July 2025) refers to Daws Heath, as a village. Furthermore, the Brook Farm Appeal (ref: APP/M1520/W/24/3351658) found that Daws Heath represented a village. The emerging policy seeks to go beyond the requirements of Paragraph 143 of the NPPF (2024) by applying its objectives in a way that would prevent any further development in or around Daws Heath. This approach is particularly restrictive, as it relies on a subjective test of 'reduction in openness or space', effectively blocking development irrespective of any demonstrated local need.		No	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	B- see add itio nal sup port ing evid enc e	The emerging DH2 policy seeks to go beyond the requirements of Paragraph 143 of the NPPF (2024) by applying its objectives in a way that would prevent any further development in or around Daws Heath. This approach is particularly restrictive, as it relies on a subjective test of 'reduction in openness or space', effectively blocking development irrespective of any demonstrated local need.	The council consider it necessary to provide additional protections to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence and maintain the openness of this area to ensure that the gaps between Daws Heath, and other settlements are maintained to protect its unique identity and semi rural character.	N
0 7 9 4 - 0	Individual	Da niel	Ada mso n		Yes	DH 2	Yes		Ye s		No further development should be permitted in the Daws Heath area. Any further development will risk the village losing its identity and it's vital that no more		No t An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed		A	No development in Daws Heath	Policy DH2 seeks to protect undeveloped land between Daws Heath	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
007											green belt land is lost. Also Daws Heath Road will not be able to cope with further development, especially at either end (Woodmans and Scrub Lane/New Road). Housing in the lower grade green belt in north Thundersley is a more viable alternative for development as the green belt there is less used, has less wildlife and is close to the main highway network of A130/A127 at Fairglens interchange.							and neighbouring settlements to prevent the coalescence of settlements.	
0937-0006	Individual	Jonathan	Pinnock		Yes	DH2	Yes		Yes				Not Answered	Not Answered		A	Supports Policy DH2	Support noted.	N
1000-0004	Agent	Sam	Hollingsworth	Rainier Developments c/o Ceres Property	Yes	DH2	No		No		5.1 Policy DH2 seeks to prevent coalescence of Daws Heath, a village located to the east of Thundersley, with neighbouring settlements. 5.2 The policy as proposed is not considered consistent with national policy or justified. Furthermore, it risks undermining potential opportunities to ensure the DLP can be considered positively prepared as defined by the NPPF. 5.3 The policy as currently drafted in the DLP states: Development of undeveloped land and intensification of developed		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes - See attachments	B - updated attachments	Policy DH2 is seeking run directly contrary to the NPPF and PPG, and the clear instruction through these that Green Belt purpose (b) (to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another) is only relevant in relation to merging of towns, and expressly confirms it is not relevant in respect of villages. The policy as worded fails to allow	The council consider it necessary to provide additional protections to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence and maintain the openness of this area to ensure that the gaps between Daws Heath, and other settlements are maintained to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											land between Daws Heath, and neighbouring settlements will only be supported where it does not result in the coalescence of settlements through a reduction in openness and space or the creation of urbanising effects between settlements. 5.4 At paragraph 12.13, the DLP explains that “Although there is Green Belt encircling Daws Heath, it is considered necessary to provide additional protections to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence and maintain the openness of this area”. 5.5 The above suggests that the policy is seeking run directly contrary to the NPPF and PPG, and the clear instruction through these that Green Belt purpose (b) (to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another) is only relevant in relation to merging of towns, and expressly confirms it is not relevant in respect of villages. 5.6 The policy as worded fails to allow decision-makers to take a balanced approach to consideration of the issue. As currently worded, the policy could be interpreted by decision-makers as requiring any proposal for development between Daws Heath and neighbouring settlements (as any development that involves a net increase in						decision-makers to take a balanced approach to consideration of the issue. As currently worded, the policy could be interpreted by decision-makers as requiring any proposal for development between Daws Heath and neighbouring settlements (as any development that involves a net increase in development could be said to result in some reduction of openness, even if only nominally) to be resisted, regardless of any benefits associated with the proposal. The plan provides nothing to suggest that any development of any land between the village and neighbouring settlements would inevitably harm its character; and appears to be based on the false assumption that new development on the edge of settlement would be intrinsically harmful to the	protect its unique identity and semi rural character.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development could be said to result in some reduction of openness, even if only nominally) to be resisted, regardless of any benefits associated with the proposal. 5.7 The purported justification as set out in the DLP is that “Engagement through the preparation of the Castle Point Plan has highlighted that residents feel it is vitally important that the unique character of Daws Heath is protected” [12.11] and “Ensuring the gaps between Daws Heath, and other settlements are maintained will protect its unique identity and semi rural character.” [12.14]. Whilst ensuring the protection (or enhancement) of the character of Daws Heath is an appropriate objective, the DLP provides nothing to suggest that any development of any land between the village and neighbouring settlements would inevitably harm its character; and appears to be based on the false assumption that new development on the edge of settlement would be intrinsically harmful to the character of the village in question.						character of the village in question.		

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0947-0005	Agent	Liam	Ryder	Roscon Group c/o CODE Development Planners Ltd	Yes	DH2	No	Within these representations CODE identify fundamental failings in CPBC's Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in relation to the appropriate consideration of reasonable alternatives. CODE is particularly concerned at the total absence of consideration for the reduced area of land east of Rayleigh Road, Thundersley (site GB13) from consideration within the SA, which is identified in other evidence base documents (including the Green Belt Assessment, July 2025) as potentially meeting the definition of Grey Belt (and thereby not being considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, subject to meeting the NPPF's golden rules). In addition to the substantial concerns regarding the SA, CODE has also identified concerns regarding the lack of clarity over CPBC's accordance with the Duty to Cooperate. The Duty to Cooperate evidence section on the local plan website is limited to one statement of common ground (SOCG) between CPBC and Essex County Council (ECC) in relation to land north west of Thundersley, which is acknowledged within to not be a viable option for	No	Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	With regard to policy DH2, the policy is inconsistent with the NPPF, particularly in relation to Grey Belt policy. Sites meet the definition of Grey Belt if they do not perform strongly against purposes a), b) and d) of the Green Belt. In relation to purpose b) (to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another) the PPG states that the purpose relates to towns, not villages. Daws Heath is a village. Policy DH2 should therefore be revised to acknowledge that there may be circumstances where sites meet the definition of Grey Belt, and would not make a strong contribution to purpose b) as Daws Heath is not a town. Schemes would, therefore, in accordance with national planning policy and guidance, be capable of being found acceptable. Policy DH2 is therefore inconsistent with national planning policy.	DH2 - Policy DH2 should be revised to acknowledge that there may be circumstances where sites meet the definition of Grey Belt, and would not make a strong contribution to purpose b) as Daws Heath is not a town. Schemes would, therefore, in accordance with national planning policy and guidance, be capable of being found acceptable. Policy DH2 is therefore inconsistent with national planning policy.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Policy DH2 is inconsistent with the NPPF, particularly in relation to Grey Belt policy. As Daws Heath is a village the policy should be revised to acknowledge that there may be circumstances where sites meet the definition of Grey Belt, and would not make a strong contribution to purpose b) as Daws Heath is not a town. Schemes would, therefore, in accordance with national planning policy and guidance, be capable of being found acceptable.	The council consider it necessary to provide additional protections to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence and maintain the openness of this area to ensure that the gaps between Daws Heath, and other settlements are maintained to protect its unique identity and semi rural character.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
								allocation in the current local plan (and nor was it appropriate for allocation in the previously withdrawn local plan). It is difficult to establish CPBC’s correspondence and cooperation with its neighbours regarding requests to accommodate some of CPBC’s need, particularly in light of the statements made within the Castle Point Plan, and across the evidence base, regarding perceived local constraints which (in CPBC’s view) excludes Green Belt sites from consideration for allocation. Indeed, paragraph 28 of the NPPF states, “In order to demonstrate effective and on-going joint working, strategic policy-making authorities should prepare and maintain one or more statements of common ground, documenting the cross-boundary matters being addressed and progress in cooperating to address these.” The NPPF further clarifies that such statements of common ground should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. The publication of one statement of common ground which relates to a													

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
								specific part of the borough, and which is not included in the local plan for consideration as an allocation is not sufficient to demonstrate appropriate co-operation with neighbouring authorities. It is noted within the officer’s report to Special Council (for the meeting on 23 July 2025) that “The key issue which is to be finalised is a final decision from adjoining and nearby councils on whether they can accept any of the unmet need from Castle Point (between 4,736 and 6,511 dwellings). This can only be completed once the Council has published its Regulation 19 draft Castle Point Plan and has specified the level of unmet need.” However, it is important to note paragraph 26 of the NPPF which stipulates, “Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary, and whether development needs that cannot be met wholly within a particular area could be met													

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								elsewhere.” The Duty to Cooperate is a gateway test for the soundness and legal compliance of a local plan. In light of the requirements of paragraph 26 of the NPPF, it is not acceptable to seek to satisfy the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate post-submission as joint working between strategic policy making authorities should have been undertaken throughout the preparation of the Castle Point Plan and cannot be applied retrospectively.											
1 0 2 0 - 0 0 0 1	Organisati on	Ma rk	Behr endt	Ho me Buil ders Fed erati on	Yes	DTC	No	As the council will be aware paragraph 33a of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the council to engage with the relevant bodies to maximise its actives – one of which is the preparation of development plans. The NPPF reiterates the importance of strategic planning across boundaries and provides further guidance on how to demonstrate compliance, stating in paragraph 26 that Councils should prepare and maintain one or more statements of common ground documenting the	No				Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	Lack of Duty to Cooperate	Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. The Council has worked collaboratively with all to ensure that the Duty to Cooperate has been met.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								cross cutting matters being addressed and progress in cooperating to address these. However, no evidence appears to have been published as to how the Council has met the duty to co-operate. The Council do state in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper that they have had discussion with their neighbouring authorities, but without any other detailed evidence the only conclusion that can be reached at pre-sent is that the council have failed in their duty to co-operate.											
0975-0002	Agent	Daniel	Rapson	Priv o Land Limi ted c/o Cere s Prop erty	Yes	DTC	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	2.1 The Duty to Cooperate is a statutory obligation placed on local planning authorities, county councils, and certain public bodies in England under the Localism Act 2011 and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It requires these bodies to engage constructively, actively, and on an ongoing basis to ensure the effective preparation of Local Plans, particularly in addressing strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries. 2.2 Key requirements of the duty to cooperate in relation to Local Plans include: • Engaging with neighbouring and relevant authorities early and throughout the plan-making process on strategic matters that cross	2.4 Castle Point Borough is not an isolated borough, and it should be recognised that it is part of a wider housing market area that includes the administrative areas of Basildon, Rochford, Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock. This geographical context is particularly relevant to the Duty to Cooperate, especially given that the Draft Local Plan (DLP) acknowledges it cannot fully meet the Borough’s housing needs. It is clear from Policy SP3 that the DLP will fall pitifully short of meeting minimum housing needs in the early years of the plan in particular – less than a third of its minimum requirement. Given this, we would have expected to see clear evidence that the	Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes	A	Lack of evidence of Duty to Cooperate - especially needed since not meeting housing need.	Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. The Council has worked collaboratively with all to ensure that the Duty to Cooperate has been met.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											administrative boundaries. • Demonstrating effective joint working, which may involve joint evidence gathering, assessment, and policy development to address shared issues like housing, infrastructure, transport, and environmental impacts. • Considering formal arrangements such as joint plans, agreements, or joint committees for strategic planning where appropriate. • Providing robust evidence of cooperation efforts, including who was engaged, the nature and timing of cooperation, and how it influenced the Local Plan. This evidence is critical for the examination of the Local Plan. • Local Plans must reflect strategic priorities, including unmet needs from neighbouring authorities where reasonable and consistent with sustainable development. 2.3 Whilst the Duty to Cooperate is not a duty to agree, Authorities should make every effort to cooperate. 2.5 There is reference in the Castle Point Borough Council Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025) to discussions having taken place under the Duty to Cooperate with neighbouring authorities. However, no details are provided as to the	Council has engaged positively, proactively, with its neighbours within the housing market area to seek to determine how the level of need the DLP fails to meet could be provided elsewhere, even if not in full. It is unfortunate that there appears to be no compelling evidence of any engagement having been carried out, both within the evidence base that backs the DLP or within the DLP itself.							

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											nature of such discussions, outcomes, etc. Furthermore, the reference relates only to neighbouring authorities' views obtained July-September 2024 on the Council's Local Housing Needs Assessment, prepared in 2023 – pre 2024 NPPF. This is now work that needs to be fundamentally reconsidered in light of the updated NPPF (December 2024) and revised PPG, and the approach Councils are now required to address the housing crisis. 2.6 It is clear that significant further work is required by the Council in order for it to be able to demonstrate that it has carried out the Duty to Cooperate positively and proactively.								
1000-0002	Agent	Sam	Hollingsworth	Rainier Developments c/o Ceres Property	Yes	DTC	No		No		2.1 The Duty to Cooperate is a legal requirement placed on local planning authorities, county councils, and certain public bodies in England under the Localism Act 2011 and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It requires these authorities to engage constructively, actively, and on an ongoing basis to maximize the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation in addressing strategic cross-boundary matters. 2.2 Key requirements of the duty to cooperate in relation to Local Plans include: Engaging with neighbouring and relevant authorities		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes - See attachments	B - updated attachments	Lack of evidence of Duty to Cooperate - especially needed since not meeting housing need.	Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. The Council has worked collaboratively with all to ensure that the Duty to Cooperate has been met.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											early and throughout the plan-making process on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries. Demonstrating effective joint working, which may involve joint evidence gathering, assessment, and policy development to address shared issues like housing, infrastructure, transport, and environmental impacts. Considering formal arrangements such as joint plans, agreements, or joint committees for strategic planning where appropriate. Providing robust evidence of cooperation efforts, including who was engaged, the nature and timing of cooperation, and how it influenced the Local Plan. This evidence is critical for the examination of the Local Plan. Local Plans must reflect strategic priorities, including unmet needs from neighbouring authorities where reasonable and consistent with sustainable development. 2.3 Whilst the Duty to Cooperate is not a duty to agree, Authorities should make every effort to cooperate. 2.4 Castle Point Borough is part of a wider housing market area that includes the administrative areas of Basildon, Rochford, Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock. This geography is								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											particularly germane in the context of the Duty to Cooperate, given the DLP claims it is unable to meet the Borough's housing needs in full. Indeed, it is clear from Policy SP3 that the DLP will fall a long way short of meeting minimum housing needs in the early years of the plan in particular – less than a third of its minimum requirement in the first five years. 2.5 Given this, we would have expected to see clear evidence that the Council has engaged positively and proactively with its neighbours within the housing market area to seek to determine how the level of need the DLP fails to meet could be accommodated elsewhere, even if not in full. There is no evidence in the DLP of any engagement having taken place, nor is there anything within the DLP which confirms the outcomes of any engagement. 2.6 There is reference in the Castle Point Borough Council Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025) to discussions having taken place under the Duty to Cooperate with neighbouring authorities. However, no details are provided as to the nature of such discussions, outcomes, etc. Furthermore, the reference relates only to neighbouring authorities'								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											views obtained July-September 2024 on the Council's Local Housing Needs Assessment, prepared in 2023 – work that needs to be fundamentally reconsidered in light of the 2024 NPPF and revised PPG, and the approach Councils are now required to take in order to address the housing crisis. 2.7 It is clear that significant further work is required by the Council in order for it to be able to demonstrate that it has carried out the Duty to Cooperate positively and proactively.								
0947-0002	Agent	Liam	Ryder	Rosconn Group c/o CODE Development Planners Ltd	Yes	DTC	No	In addition to the substantial concerns regarding the SA, CODE has also identified concerns regarding the lack of clarity over CPBC's accordance with the Duty to Cooperate. The Duty to Cooperate evidence section on the local plan website is limited to one statement of common ground (SOCG) between CPBC and Essex County Council (ECC) in relation to land north west of Thundersley, which is acknowledged within to not be a viable option for allocation in the current local plan (and nor was it appropriate for allocation in the previously withdrawn local plan). It is difficult to establish CPBC's correspondence and cooperation with its	No	Positively prepared, Justified, Consistent with national policy			Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Lack of evidence of Duty to Cooperate	Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. The Council has worked collaboratively with all to ensure that the Duty to Cooperate has been met.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
								neighbours regarding requests to accommodate some of CPBC’s need, particularly in light of the statements made within the Castle Point Plan, and across the evidence base, regarding perceived local constraints which (in CPBC’s view) excludes Green Belt sites from consideration for allocation. Indeed, paragraph 28 of the NPPF states, “In order to demonstrate effective and on-going joint working, strategic policy-making authorities should prepare and maintain one or more statements of common ground, documenting the cross-boundary matters being addressed and progress in cooperating to address these.” The NPPF further clarifies that such statements of common ground should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. The publication of one statement of common ground which relates to a specific part of the borough, and which is not included in the local plan for consideration as an allocation is not sufficient to demonstrate appropriate co-operation with neighbouring authorities.													

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
								It is noted within the officer’s report to Special Council (for the meeting on 23 July 2025) that “The key issue which is to be finalised is a final decision from adjoining and nearby councils on whether they can accept any of the unmet need from Castle Point (between 4,736 and 6,511 dwellings). This can only be completed once the Council has published its Regulation 19 draft Castle Point Plan and has specified the level of unmet need.” However, it is important to note paragraph 26 of the NPPF which stipulates, “Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary, and whether development needs that cannot be met wholly within a particular area could be met elsewhere.” The Duty to Cooperate is a gateway test for the soundness and legal compliance of a local plan. In light of the requirements of paragraph 26 of the													

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								NPPF, it is not acceptable to seek to satisfy the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate post-submission as joint working between strategic policy making authorities should have been undertaken throughout the preparation of the Castle Point Plan and cannot be applied retrospectively.											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
0334-0002	Organisati on	Gle nn	Smit h	ACT Roa dwa ys ltd		E1	No	Key priorities: Employment, Innovation and Economic Development• Canvey Seafront - to attract commercial investment and enhance the seafront appearance/facilities, creating more jobs for local people and improving the leisure and recreational opportunities for local people and visitors. • Northwick Road - Canvey - To attract investment into the area and create high quality jobs for local people. • Charfleets Industrial Estate - Canvey - To improve access on to the estate and extend the estate. • Manor Trading Estate, Benfleet - Redevelopment of the trading estate for residential purposes and the relocation of the existing uses to a new site in the north of the Borough. • Opps the 4th priority, says, the MTE will be redeveloped for new housing! • With us the businesses on the MTE relocating to the North! • The site they suggest as “North” is commonly referred to by CPBC as GB16! • Discussions & public meetings during Aug & Sept 24 this GB16 parcel was the obvious answer to economic regeneration in terms of business expansion, & investment along with significant new circa 5000+ affordable housing under	No		Further anomalies.CPBC have made some significant errors in this envisaged plan which contradict its own documents.1st They suggest that the MTE is 14.5 Hectare its only 12.5 at best. That’s fact2nd They indicate in one document that the West Side of the MTE commercial properties (circa 3.4 Ha - 25% of the estate) is to go being replaced with 200 residential units. One presumes they are using a multiplier of 50 to 55 per Ha, based on that density they will be Apartments and not houses with gardens and amenity space.3rd Where might those new residents work!4th CPBC then totally contradict themselves. They have produced another document that indicates the whole of the manor trading estate is to be replaced with housing. Not just the western side! BUT significantly they still suggest only 200 residential units. Simple calculation if we reflect that CPBC officers say the MTE is 14.5 Ha that’s a density of 13.7 residential units per hectare not very good return for decimating the local economy. Perhaps the idea is to attract new residents to the area that are wealthy. Perhaps the aim is to develop mini mansions with a buying price of circa £1.5M. they would be considered truly affordable					Yes - see atta ch me nt	B - see 033 4 - 003	Concern for the businesses currently operating within the borough and where they will go due to the proposed mixed use sites allocated.	NotedManor Trading Estate is included within Policy E1 which includes the statement ' the Council will seek to provide and retain Class E(g), B2 and B8 use classes or other ‘sui generis’ uses of a similar employment nature unless it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect for the site to be used for these purposes'	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								grey belt scenarios. • Using the GB16 parcel would have delivered significant infrastructure investment & improvements to the local road network. It would have relieved severe congestion into and around Benfleet particularly at Sadlers Farm, The Tarpots and the local residential Church Road neighbourhood. Whilst doing so the GB16 parcel would have allowed all residents in residential areas of Thundersley Old or new to be able to access the local housing road networks without using the 3 severely congested area noted above. • CPBC after putting this local plan forward for public consultation in July 25, produced a green belt review in August, which justified why that GB16 plot was not a viable option to include in the Local plan. One wonders why this wasn't produced and presented prior to the committee voting unanimously to take this to public consultation. • Yet at this day whilst writing this objection 23rd Sept 2025 the same council still informs anyone who might consider investing in new business, or indeed anyone already here investing in improvements Should not bother! Why would anyone invest in a business new or old where the local council says its being demolished and			for the local community.5th No one has informed anyone on the trading estate where we are going to be rehoused.6th It appears that CPBC think it's OK to dictate that all the business's on the MTE, should up sticks & move to Canvey which is neither accessible nor affordable. This is the same Canvey that has one single carriageway in & out that has significant traffic congestion daily.7th The effect this plan will have on the local economy will be devastating to existing business's or anyone who might want to invest in a local business. This plan will drive business away from Castle Point to a more supportive local council. Fact Basildon, Rochford Southend & Thurrock support local business and encourage new business.8th For CPBC to even suggest that they will be decimating the local business perhaps they might put a figure on the purchase of the Private Road Network. In doing so take on the legal responsibilities that come with the deeds of grants and covenants that go with the title.9th Suffice any plan to redevelop the MTE will come at a premium. A.C.T Roadways Ltd do not consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be Sound. It fails the tests of soundness on the business								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								replaced by housing. • Who will be funding the business move, who will value a redundant property value, who will support the enormous cost of moving the business's • Where might the Businesses on the MTE be relocate too.			front alone. Again, business is the life blood of any local plan. CPBC officers have not engaged with the 120 businesses on MTE. I have engaged with them. Suffice the great majority have not only engaged with me & A.C.T they have more importantly willingly contributed significant sums of money which has allowed us as a business community to execute significant improvements to the estate. those improvements have had a desired effect! significantly the aim is over the next 5 years by 2030 have an estate fund that expends Circa £550,000.00 that is and will continue to contribute to the local economy as well as bring forward new investment. That's true regeneration. Point to Note even as at today many on the estate are still not aware of Castle Point Councils intentions regards this estate. This draft local plan is not evidence based which is considered a very basic requirement of any local plan. I am confident that albeit the residents not the businesses of CPBC might allow this to go forward the inspector on reviewing & after due diligence will find this plan unsound thus reject it That rejection will come at an enormous cost to us the taxpayers of Castle Point.								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											Officers & councillors for some reason have relayed / conveyed a figure of £1.7M. against the cost of developing a compliant plan, quite why they relayed that figure I'm not sure, perhaps they thought the resident would be swayed to say yes!								
0330-0003	Organisation	Michael	Murrel	Basildon Council		E1	No	1.8 Policy E1 and E2 sets out how the Council will meet their employment needs as identified in the Economic Land Demand forecast produced by Experian (2024) for a net demand of 4,000m2 additional office floor space, which can be met by current oversupply of potential 9.5 ha based against extant permissions.	No	Positively Prepared, Justified, Consistent with National Policy, Effective	1.10 Whilst the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP 2025) produced by DAC Planning concludes that there are no significant issues or concern identified which could have an impact on the strategy of the emerging Castle Point Plan, the methodology was based on three growth scenarios previously identified in the Regulation 18 draft plan. It is understood that an addendum will be carried out to provide an update to the document, Basildon Council considers it essential that Castle Point update the IDP accordingly					B - confirm for formal response	Notes that CP can meet its employment needs and there is an oversupply	Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											to take full account of the urban renewal and regeneration approach proposed in the Regulation 19 Plan. Therefore, it is vital that the IDP is updated to ensure that sufficient provision for the delivery of new infrastructure is made to support the proposed level of growth.								
0284-0006	Organisation	Emma	Goodings	Brentwood Borough Council	Not Stated	E1	Yes	BBC is broadly supportive of these policies and the CPLP's overall economic strategy. It is acknowledged that the provision of new employment land in and around town centres, and the safeguarding of economy use at existing sites may provide opportunities to broaden and diversity the local economy and provide employment opportunities for residents of a wider area both directly and indirectly through supplementing wider supply chains.	Yes						No	A	Supports economic policy for strategic development of employment land	Noted	N
0282-0028	Organisation	Kevin	Frasier	Essex County Council	Yes	E1	Not Stated		No	Effective	ECC seek masterplans should be 'approved' rather than 'agreed' by the council prior to the determination of any planning application, and should set out the development principles and supporting evidence. An approved masterplan will accord significant weight in the determination of planning applications by CPBC. This is consistent with Policy D3 - Master Planning, criteria 1 which states: Where this Plan requires	ECC require Criteria 2 is amended to read: Within Strategic Employment Areas, and until such time as a Master Plan is approved ECC require the following addition to the Reasoned Justification to read: The Essex and Thurrock Local Skills Improvement Plan (2023) identifies key skills gaps and aims to create a more flexible, responsive education and training system. Key priorities include boosting soft skills,	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various	B	Masterplans should be approved by the council prior to determination of any planning application Add the Experian Land Demand Forecast for Castle Point September 2024 to the evidence base	Accepted CPBC agree that masterplans should be approved prior to any planning application Accepted reference added	Within Strategic Employment Areas, and until such time as a Master Plan is approved, agreed, Class B development or other

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											the use of Master Plans for allocated sites, these will be approved by the Council in advance of the determination of any planning application. Reference should be made to the Essex and Thurrock Local Skills Improvement Plan (2023) which identifies key skills gaps and identifies key priorities to be delivered through partnerships between employers, training providers, and local authorities to meet the evolving needs of the local economy.	enhancing green skills for a low-carbon economy, developing digital skills, expanding apprenticeships, improving careers guidance, and simplifying the landscape for training providers and employers. The plan emphasises stronger partnerships between employers, training providers, and local authorities to meet the evolving needs of the local economy.			pieces of evidence				'sui generis' uses will be supported which: f. Development proposals must be designed to protect and enhance enable and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0258-0001	Agent	Lorna	O'Carroll	Iceni OBO Richborough Commercial	Yes	E1	No	Iceni Projects ("Iceni") have significant concerns in respect of the Castle Point's employment land needs modelling, which do not accurately forecast future needs and significantly underestimate the need for employment land over the plan period. The evidence is also not PPG-compliant which raises significant issues of soundness for the plan. 2. 3. At a regional level, Castle Point holds an important location within South Essex's economic geography. The Borough plays a key role in supporting the supply chain for Basildon's manufacturing and logistics sectors, such as materials and components supplies.	No	Consistent with National Policy	It is therefore concerning that the current approach taken by Castle Point does not take account of the Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) and seek to support it. 4. These representations are framed in terms of the 'tests of soundness' in paragraph 36 of the NPPF and are supported by a Review of Employment Land Needs Evidence (Iceni, September 2025).	As discussed within this representation, Iceni consider that Castle Point should make the following changes to their draft Local Plan prior to the submission to the Secretary of State: Review the employment evidence base to ensure that it is compliant with the PPG. Changes arising should be reflected in the strategic needs for the Borough, either through a new policy or an updated Policy E2. This review should be undertaken in consultation with adjoining authorities. The wider evidence base should also be reviewed to ensure consistency of approach. 5. • Update Policy T2 to be consistent with national policy. 2 a. Representations 6. Iceni have been instructed by Richborough Commercial ("Richborough") to provide representations on Castle Point's Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan Consultation. 7. Richborough have an interest in the 'Land west of Canvey Way', which lies within the administrative boundary of Basildon Borough Council, however, it requires access from Canvey Way within Castle Point's administrative boundaries. 8. The Site benefits from a draft allocation, being identified as a "potential site for employment" within the emerging Regulation 18 Basildon Local Plan (ref. E4	Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes	A	<u>Economy and Employment</u> The Council's strategic employment strategy fails to meet the economic development needs of the area and similarly does not consider the implications for the wider South Essex functional economic markets. The Council's evidence base that has informed the development strategy for employment is flawed for the reasons set out within these representations, and therefore the proposed strategy has not taken into account the reasonable alternative. Consistent with national policy – The evidence base being flawed and not PPG compliant demonstrates its inconsistency with national policy. A new policy, or alternatively an updated Policy E2 should be incorporated. Castle Point plays	Comments noted. <u>Employment</u> Castle Point's role within a wider South Essex economy is well recognised in the Plan and the development of new floorspace is supported. As set out in the July 2025 Employment Topic Paper - '5.1 The determination of future employment land needs for Castle Point Borough forms a central component of the emerging Local Plan. This process involves a forward-looking assessment of the types and quantities of employment floorspace likely to be required over a 20-year period (2023–	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												Land West of Canvey Way), to contribute towards meeting Basildon Borough Council’s need for “at least 65-82ha of new employment land” over the plan period to 2043.					an important role in regional economy, but the current approach to employment needs set out by the Plan fails to support economic growth aspirations in neighbouring authorities (i.e. Basildon). A more strategic approach needs to be taken by Castle Point. As demonstrated within the supporting Review of Employment Land Needs Evidence (prepared by the Icení Economics Team, September 2025), we have significant concerns about the Council’s position taken in respect of employment need. Through this, we therefore have fundamental concerns about the soundness of Policy SP3 as being suitable to meet the development need. Dispute findings an conclusions of Transport evidence and the Employment Topic Paper. In response to issues highlighted	<i>2043), with the intention of supporting sustainable economic growth, business investment, and job creation within the Borough. The analysis follows national guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), which require that planning authorities make sufficient provision for commercial development, including for different types of employment use, based on objective and proportionate evidence (see paragraph 2.2).</i>	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	around Castle Points’s economy, new employment development (for example at Canvey Way) will help provide employment opportunities within Castle Point, increasing job density and reducing out-commuting. In addition, new employment development will help support target growth sectors such as advanced manufacturing and green energy, businesses which typically requiring higher-spec modern premises. Logistics and distribution space is also key in supporting the supply-chains of the target growth sectors.	<i>5.2 The employment land need forecast (– 2.02 ha net) indicates that Castle Point already has sufficient land—both designated and permitted—to meet future demand. Therefore, the Local Plan’s strategy is to optimise and intensify existing employment land, rather than allocating new sites.</i> <i>5.3 To support this assessment, the Council commissioned and adopted the Experian Economic Land Demand Forecast (September 2024). This modelled the future trajectory of employment across a range of land use classes, drawing on</i>	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		<i>demographic trends, sectoral growth assumptions, local economic baselines, and commercial property market benchmarks. '</i>	
0332-0002	Agent	Corin	Williams	Iceni OBO The Inner London Group		E1	No	Inner London agree with the general principles of Policy E1 and E2 which seek to increase jobs by increasing the amount of high-quality employment space within the Borough but disagree with the soundness of the approach which focuses new commercial provision exclusively towards existing employment designations and town centre sites. 2.18 Paragraph 14.10 of the supporting text confirms that these policies have been based on the findings of the Experian Economic Demand forecast for Castle Point September 2024 which states that “there is a net demand of 4,000m2 of additional office floorspace in the Borough, but a small shrinkage in the demand for new land for industrial uses and warehousing growth is negligible”. As established by the Iceni Economic Note, these figures are based upon a baseline labour demand			Whist Inner London understand that the Council seek to improve these areas, there is no consideration as to where the current occupants will move to whilst the employment areas are being redeveloped. The Iceni Economic Note finds that this has been compounded by the fact that “no allowance has been made for replacement demand which considers the replacement of stock lost to other uses and the need to replace aging stock. Industrial and warehousing stock typically have a lifecycle of 30-40 years and so an allowance should be made to replace a proportion of pre-2000s stock which will become obsolete during the course of Plan Period.”. It stands to reason that the Council will need to “decant” existing occupiers to free up for redevelopment meaning that additional	Inner London request that the employment need is recalculated and that a separate policy be added to guide the development of land that is outside existing employment areas or town centres.				B	<u>Policies E1 and E2</u> Agree with the general principles of Policy E1 and E2 which seek to increase jobs by increasing the amount of high-quality employment space within the Borough but disagree with the soundness of the approach which focuses new commercial provision exclusively towards existing employment designations and town centre sites. The supporting text confirms that these policies have been based on the findings of the Experian Economic Demand forecast for Castle Point September 2024	Policies E1 and E2 Noted As set out in paragraph 14.14 'A review of the Borough’s stock of employment land was undertaken in the Economic Sites Review 2024 to identify what opportunities exist to increase economic productivity. It identified that there are three principal sites that constitute the current and potential future strategic employment land supply:	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
								model which has significantly underestimated the need for employment space within the Borough, particularly for industrial uses, and that the Council should be planning for a minimum of 11.9ha of employment space over the plan period to meet needs. 2.19 Given the flaws in the supporting evidence, the Council needs to reassess whether it is a realistic prospect to accommodate 11.9ha employment demand within the existing employment areas (namely, Charfleets Trading Estate, Manor Trading Estate and Stadium Way). Paragraph 14.15 of the plan recognises the current condition of these areas stating that “At present the Borough’s Strategic Employment Areas are well occupied, but of generally poor quality in terms of environment. The building stock is generally poor, except for new development to the south of Roscommon Way (the Inner London development)”. A further review of these sites has found them to be densely packed and comprised mostly of small units with limited yard / parking space. Taking in respect of the Borough-wide available supply, the Icen Economics Note states that “there is just one modern unit built in 2020 at Amber			floorspace will be required. By having a 0ha employment need over the next 17 years, the council is not planning for this identified need and as a result is not positively prepared and is therefore unsound.							which states that “there is a net demand of 4,000m2 of additional office floorspace in the Borough, but a small shrinkage in the demand for new land for industrial uses and warehousing growth is negligible”. As established by the Icen Economic Note (attached separately), these figures are based upon a baseline labour demand model which has significantly underestimated the need for employment space within the Borough, particularly for industrial uses, and that the Council should be planning for a minimum of 11.9ha of employment space over the plan period to meet needs The Council needs to reassess whether it is a realistic prospect to accommodate 11.9ha employment demand within the existing employment areas (namely, Charfleets	- Charfleets Trading Estate is a large set of industrial estates in the west of Canvey Island. This area is currently growing, and there is further potential for investment in the site which could drive intensification , increasing floorspace and jobs across the area. - Manor Trading Estate is a large industrial site in north Benfleet. There is high occupancy on the site, despite relatively poor infrastructure, notably the access to and around the site. - Stadium Way, Rayleigh Weir, is a smaller industrial	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Industrial Park. Overall, there is a distinct lack of modern stock available in Castle Point. There are no options for mid-size businesses looking to move”.									Trading Estate, Manor Trading Estate and Stadium Way). Roscommon Way, Canvey Island Review of Employment Land Needs evidence attached separately	estate with excellent occupation rates and limited opportunity for intensification .'	
0 6 2 4 - 0 0 0 5	Individual	Mary	Bimson		Yes	E1	No	We will be an area that’s just residential, no shops no employers, people will have to leave the island to find employment, but they won’t be able to get off the island because of the huge amount of traffic trying to leave the island	No	Justified	We won’t have room for any businesses so no employment	We need employers, for that we can’t just be residential	No	Not Answered		A	Need business premissis not just residential	The Plan is not just residential, it ensures that there is sufficient employment land and commercial floorspace to support the needs of the local economy. Policies E1-E4 cover "Supporting Employment and Tourism".	N
1 0 1 2 - 0 0 1 1	Agent	Arun	Sriskanda	Oikos Storage Ltd c/o Adams Hendry Con	Yes	E1	Yes		Yes		Oikos welcomes and supports the acknowledgement within the policy that the South Canvey Port Facilities are a strategic employment area for the Borough and that the facilities are key industrial assets (paragraph 14.27) which provide scope for economic growth through		Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Oikos welcomes and supports the acknowledgement within the policy that the South Canvey Port Facilities are a strategic employment area for the Borough and that the facilities are	Support noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
				sulti ng Ltd							the energy sector (paragraph 14.9).						key industrial assets (paragraph 14.27) which provide scope for economic growth through the energy sector (paragraph 14.9).		
0 9 3 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joh n	Ston e		Yes	E1	No	Excluding and / or failing to adequately consider strategic alternatives across the Borough. There is no clear evidence of the fulfillment of the Councils 'Duty to Co-operate.	No	Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The nature of Charfleets Industrial Estate and the types of businesses contained on it has not been properly evaluated. Many of the businesses do not appear to have any idea of what is being proposed. These types of businesses are not suitable for habitable dwellings above them. Should redevelopment of the estate proceed at the level suggested this would cause severe problems for many of these businesses leading to many of them closing down either willingly or forcibly. Any new estate as suggested with dwellings above the businesses would soon become like a ghetto and would not be a very nice place to live and would be detrimental to the Health and Wellbeing of the estate's residents. Charfleets is within the blast radius of the two Top Tier COMAH sites. The drainage system, both surface water and foul, would not cope.	Reduce the urban housing target for the Borough. Consider other more suitable sites across the Borough especially North West Thundersley.	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Strategic Alternatives Duty to cooperate Concerned about the business uses next to residential on E1 COMAH Flood Risk on Canvey North West thundersley	Strategic Alternatives North west Thundersley is in the Greenbelt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CPBC and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		was not preferred. Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Duty to Cooperate Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. The Council has worked collaboratively with all to ensure that the Duty to Cooperate has been met. Buisness uses next to residential on sites covered by policy E1 ie C4 West Canvey. This states at paragraph	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		8.36 There are a mix of uses within the industrial estate including offices, gyms, nurseries, car sales and also heavier industry such as steel manufacturing . It is therefore important that the Master Plan for the area sets out a land use strategy that encourages renewal and regeneration but avoids issues of residential amenity and addresses the agent of change principle for noisy businesses already in the area. COMAH As set out in Plan paragraph 8.28 'Both port facilities are registered as Control of	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) sites due to the hazardous nature of the goods that they receive and store. The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and the Environment Agency are responsible for regulating activities at these sites, and also provide advice on the level of hazard the installations pose to nearby development. Both installations have HSE consultation zones identified around them, in which it is expected that other development is controlled to limit unnecessary harm to life and property. The extent of these zones is	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		determined by the nature of the goods received and stored on site, and the technical measures employed to ensure safety at the sites. It is therefore possible that the level of hazard posed to other developments nearby can be reduced, both by limiting development nearby, and also by seeking improvements to the level of hazard posed by these sites, both during normal management and maintenance, and also at the point where new development is proposed.' The current HSE consultation zones are indicated on the policies	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		map. The plan doesn't propose any new housing allocations in the HSE consultation zone. However, some existing residential areas are already within the zone, as well as the Thorney Bay Park Homes site. Policy SD8 'Development near Hazardous Uses' states that 'Development proposals will be assessed in accordance with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Guidance where they fall within a consultation zone for one or more hazardous installations. Where the HSE advises against	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		development the planning application will be refused on health and safety grounds’. Flood Risk on Canvey Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is substantially defended from flooding. The recommendations of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment do not seek to restrict the overall level of development in the borough, including on Canvey, but aim to direct the location of development and/or the design of development to minimise exposure to flood risk. Furthermore, flooding and the need for flood	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4, SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the plan, and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	
0283-0005	Organisation	Emma	Goodings	Rochford District Council	Not Stated	E1	Yes	Policy E1 and E2: RDC is broadly supportive of these policies and the CPLP's overall economic strategy. It is acknowledged that the provision of new employment land in and around town centres, and the safeguarding of economy use at existing sites (including at SEL2: Stadium Way, Rayleigh Weir) may provide opportunities to broaden and diversity the	Yes				Not Stated		No	A	Supports CP plan's economic policies Policy	Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								local economy and provide employment opportunities for residents of a wider area, including Rochford District, both directly and indirectly through supplementing wider supply chains. Approach to Town Centre and Retail											
1 4 4 0 - 0 0 2 2	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	E1	Yes		No	Justified	These sites could have extensive provision to accommodate brownfield habitat enhancements that will improve these large sites for biodiversity and reduce management costs.	We suggest adding provision for brownfield habitat enhancements across the sites. For example, adding to 2d) to read: "Provide brownfield habitat enhancements, and environmental improvements such as to the quality of open spaces, landscaping, roads, drains, and communication infrastructure;	No				These sites could have extensive provision to accommodate brownfield habitat enhancements that will improve these large sites for biodiversity and reduce management costs.	Noted	N
0 2 8 4 - 0 0 0 7	Organisati on	Em ma	Good ing s	Bren two od Boro ugh Cou ncil	Not State d	E2	Yes	BBC is broadly supportive of these policies and the CPLP's overall economic strategy. It is acknowledged that the provision of new employment land in and around town centres, and the safeguarding of economy use at existing sites may provide opportunities to broaden and diversity the local economy and provide employment opportunities for residents of a wider area both directly and indirectly through supplementing wider supply chains.	Yes						No	A	Supports policy for new floorspace in town centres	Noted	N
0 2 8 3 - 0 0	Organisati on	Em ma	Good ing s	Roc hfor d Distr ict Cou ncil	Not State d	E2	Yes	Policy E1 and E2: RDC is broadly supportive of these policies and the CPLP's overall economic strategy. It is acknowledged that the provision of new employment land in and	Yes				Not Sta ted		No	A	Supports CP's economic policies Notes safeguarding sites such as SEL2: Stadium Way, Rayleigh Weir and new provision offers	Noted Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
06								around town centres, and the safeguarding of economy use at existing sites (including at SEL2: Stadium Way, Rayleigh Weir) may provide opportunities to broaden and diversity the local economy and provide employment opportunities for residents of a wider area, including Rochford District, both directly and indirectly through supplementing wider supply chains.									employment opportunities to wider area including Rochford.		
02820029	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	E3	Not Stated		No	Effective	ECC requires all strategic scale planning applications of 50 or more homes or employment space providing 2,500sqm (GIA) or more floorspace, to enter into an Employment and Skills Plan to provide employment and skills opportunities to benefit the local community as referenced in paragraph 14.41. ECC requires this to be incorporated into Criteria 1 to afford it the necessary weight in determining planning applications. Reference should be made to the Essex and Thurrock Local Skills Improvement Plan (2023) which identifies key skills gaps and identifies key priorities to be delivered through partnerships between employers, training providers, and local authorities to meet the evolving needs of the local economy.	ECC require Criteria 1 is amended to read: Require major developments to be supported by Employment education and Skills Plans that demonstrate how local training and employment opportunities will be delivered by the development during the construction phase. ECC require the following addition to the Reasoned Justification to read: The Essex and Thurrock Local Skills Improvement Plan (2023) identifies key skills gaps and aims to create a more flexible, responsive education and training system. Key priorities include boosting soft skills, enhancing green skills for a low-carbon economy, developing digital skills, expanding apprenticeships, improving careers guidance, and simplifying the landscape for training providers and employers. The plan	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Need to specify that major applications need to provide employment and skills plans with their applications Add reference to the Essex and Thurrock Skills Improvement Plan (2023)	Accepted additional text requiring employment and skills plans with major applications Accepted and reference added.	1. Require major developments to be supported by Employment education and Skills Plans that demonstrate how local training and employment opportunities will be delivered by the development during the

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												emphasises stronger partnerships between employers, training providers, and local authorities to meet the evolving needs of the local economy.							construc tion phase. These will be secured as part of the S106 agreeme nt. The Essex and Thurrock Local Skills Improve ment Plan (2023) identifie s key skills gaps and aims to create a more flexible, responsi ve educatio n and training system. Key priorities include boosting soft skills, enhanci ng green skills for a low-

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			carbon economy, developing digital skills, expanding apprenticeships, improving careers guidance, and simplifying the landscape for training providers and employers. The plan emphasises stronger partnerships between employers, training providers, and local authorities to meet the evolving needs of the local economy.

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0284-0010	Organisation	Emma	Goodings	Brentwood Borough Council	Not Stated	ENV 1	Yes	BBC has no specific concerns over the soundness of this policy, or the wider environmental strategy	Yes						No	A	No concerns over the soundness of protecting and enhancing the landscape policy	Noted	N
0332-0004	Agent	Corin	Williams	Icenio OBO The Inner London Group		ENV 1	No	Inner London support the broad intentions of policy ENV1, especially the aims for all development to contribute positively towards creating a visually attractive environment. Point 2 however, which requires all development proposals to “seek to protect and enhance key natural / semi-natural and historical features” is considered to put an unnecessary burden on developments and should only be required where feasible.	No	Positively Prepared	The majority of proposals are already required to provide a 10% Biodiversity net gain enhancement, a figure that the Council seeks to increase to 20% in draft policy ENV3. Requiring all developments to make enhancements to key natural / semi – natural and historical features as well as provide a 20% uplift to biodiversity is considered unreasonable and should only be required where feasible. As such, the existing policy is likely to discourage development by unduly impacting their viability and deliverability and therefore cannot be considered positively prepared or sound in accordance with the NPPF.					B	<u>Policy ENV1 – Protecting and Enhancing the Landscape and Landscape Features</u> Inner London support the broad intentions of policy ENV1, especially the aims for all development to contribute positively towards creating a visually attractive environment. Point 2 however, which requires all development proposals to “seek to protect and enhance key natural / semi-natural and historical features” is considered to put an unnecessary burden on developments and should only be required where feasible. The majority of proposals are already required to provide a 10% Biodiversity net gain	The Plan accords with the NPPF overarching objectives, including to 'Protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment' (NPPF 8c). NPPF paragraph 20 is clear that strategic policies should ensure 'conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure' and paragraph 136 is clear that existing trees should be retained wherever possible.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	enhancement, a figure that the Council seeks to increase to 20% in draft policy ENV3. Requiring all developments to make enhancements to key natural / semi – natural and historical features as well as provide a 20% uplift to biodiversity is considered unreasonable and should only be required where feasible. As such, the existing policy is likely to discourage development by unduly impacting their viability and deliverability and therefore cannot be considered positively prepared or sound in accordance with the NPPF	Public authorities have a legal duty under the Environment Act 2021 to consider what they can do to conserve and enhance biodiversity as part of their decision-making. This includes both protecting existing features and working to improve their condition. In line with national policy, statutory bodies emphasise the retention, conservation, and enhancement of existing and historic features.	
0341-0014	Organisation	Janet	Nuttall	Natural England		ENV1	Yes	We recommend including a reference to National Character Areas and Local Landscape Character Assessment areas (where datasets for these are available) Natural England - National Character Area Profiles - National Character Area Profiles.	Yes							A	We recommend including a reference to National Character Areas and Local Landscape Character Assessment areas (where	<u>Modification : New paragraph in Policy ENV1</u> 4. Development proposals	<u>Modification: New paragraph in Policy ENV1</u> 4. Development

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	datasets for these are available) Natural England - National Character Area Profiles - National Character Area Profiles.	should be designed to reflect character, features and priorities of established Landscape Character Areas and landscape assessments. <u>Modification : New Reasoned Justification Paragraph</u> 18.6 The Natural England National Landscape Character Areas, as well as local Essex Landscape Character Assessments provide a way of understanding how the landscape and its	ment proposals should be designed to reflect character, features and priorities of established Landscape Character Areas and landscape assessments. <u>Modification: New Reasoned Justification Paragraph</u> 18.6 The Natural Engla

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		elements contribute to local character, sense of place, and local distinctive ness can be preserved and enhanced. Canvey and southern areas of the Borough form part of the Thames Estuary Landscape Character Area, while northern parts of the Borough form part of the Northern Thames Basin/South Essex Coastal Towns Landscape Character Area	nd National Lands cape Character Areas, as well as local Essex Lands cape Character Asses sment s provid e a way of under standi ng how the landsc ape and its eleme nts contri bute to local charac ter, sense of place, and local

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			distinctiveness can be preserved and enhanced. Canvey and southern areas of the Borough form part of the Thames Estuary Landscape Character Area, while northern parts of the Borough form part of the Northern Thames

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			Basin/ South Essex Coast al Towns Lands cape Chara cter Area
0 9 3 7 - 0 0 0 8	Individual	Jon ath an	Pinn ock		Yes	ENV V1	Yes		Yes				Not An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed		A	Supports Policy ENV1	Support noted.	N
0 2 8 3 - 0 0 0 8	Organisati on	Em ma	Goo ding s	Roc hfor d Distr ict Cou ncil	Not State d	ENV 1	Yes	Approach to Environment, Biodiversity and Landscape Policy ENV1: RDC has no specific concerns over the soundness of this policy, or the wider environmental strategy. RDC however requests for further clarification regarding the inclusion of Kingley Wood (an area of ancient woodland within the Rochford District administrative boundary) in CPLP interactive mapping.					Not Sta ted		No	A	Supports Policy. Raises query re inclusion of Kingley Wood (an area of ancient woodland within the Rochford District administrative boundary) in CPLP interactive mapping.	Noted mapping anomaly amended	N
1 4 4 0 - 0 0 0 1	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	ENV 1	Yes		Yes		There should be provision included to enable conservation organisations such as the RSPB to install any further predator exclusion fences on West Canvey Marshes. They may potentially be considered to affect landscape character,	There should be provision included to enable conservation organisations such as the RSPB to install any further predator exclusion fences on West Canvey Marshes. They may potentially be considered to affect landscape character,	No				There should be provision included to enable conservation organisations such as the RSPB to install any further predator exclusion fences on West	Covered in supporting text to ENV5 rep	18.43 The hedghe g is now officially National Hedgeho g

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											but an exemption clause for reasonable, evidence-based use to enhance biodiversity should be provided in Policy to allow the RSPB - and others as appropriate - to continue important work for nature.	but an exemption clause for reasonable use to enhance biodiversity should be provided in Policy.					Canvey Marshes. They may potentially be considered to affect landscape character, but an exemption clause for reasonable, evidence-based use to enhance biodiversity should be provided in Policy to allow the RSPB - and others as appropriate - to continue important work for nature.		Conservation Strategy, published in October 2024. 'Conservation' fencing, such as predator exclusion fences installed on reserves by conservation organisations, may be exempt from the requirement, as appropriate
1085-0001	Individual	Suzanne	Zammit		Yes	ENV1	Yes		No	Positively prepared	There should be more care to protect trees by putting TPOs on all oaks in the areas where building may take place so that we do not lose these precious old trees and so that we preserve Green spaces and biodiversity	There should be more care to protect trees by putting TPOs on all oaks in the areas where building may take place so that we do not lose these precious old trees and so that we preserve Green spaces and biodiversity	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		More care to protect trees by putting TPOs on all oak trees	Comments noted.	N
1027-000	Agent	c/o agent	c/o agent	Taylor Wimpey	Yes	ENV1	Yes		No	Consistent with national policy	Paragraph 2 of Policy ENV1 refers to 'protect'; however, this is not aligned with national policy. Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should 'contribute	Policy ENV1 is not Sound as it is not consistent with the NPPF. It should be amended accordingly – 'Development proposals should seek to minimise harm and where practicable enhance key	No	Not Answered		A	Paragraph 2 of Policy ENV1 refers to 'protect'; however, this is not aligned with national policy. Paragraph 187 of	Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5											to and enhance the natural and local environment' by: protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan). The list of features covered in paragraph 2 are not such designated sites or features. Paragraph 188 of the NPPF states that plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites. The policy should do this. Policy ENV1 is not Sound as it is not consistent with the NPPF. It should be amended accordingly – 'Development proposals should seek to minimise harm and where practicable enhance key natural/ semi-natural and historical features'.	natural/ semi-natural and historical features'.					the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should 'contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment' by: protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan). The list of features covered in paragraph 2 are not such designated sites or features. Paragraph 188 of the NPPF states that plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites. The policy should do this. Policy ENV1 is not Sound as it is not consistent with the NPPF. It should be amended accordingly – 'Development proposals should seek to minimise harm and where practicable		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	enhance key natural/ semi-natural and historical features'		
0329-0001	Organisati on	Ben	Green	The Woodland Trust		ENV 1		The Woodland Trust welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Castle Point Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan. As the UK's leading woodland conservation charity, our mission is to protect and restore ancient woodland, increase native tree cover, and inspire people to enjoy and value woods and trees. These priorities are rooted in tackling the twin crises of climate change and biodiversity loss, while creating healthier and more resilient places for people and wildlife. We commend Castle Point Borough Council for producing a Local Plan with clear ambitions to enhance biodiversity, strengthen green infrastructure, and address climate resilience.				However, to ensure that the Plan delivers genuine nature recovery and meets the challenges ahead, we recommend strengthening several policies to better protect irreplaceable habitats, deliver higher environmental gains, and embed long-term tree strategy objectives. This response sets out detailed comments on key policy areas, structured around Woodland Trust priorities. 1. Vision and Objectives The Plan's vision to make Castle Point the "green heart of South Essex" is laudable, particularly the ambition to deliver multifunctional green infrastructure, connected habitats, and climate-adapted development. Environmental objectives (Obj 2, Obj 3, Obj 4) set a strong foundation, but to ensure these are actionable we recommend: • Embedding measurable canopy cover and biodiversity indicators, aligned with our Tree Strategy Template's call for a seven per cent canopy increase over 16 years and a 30 per cent canopy cover target for all new developments. • Explicitly committing to bigger, better, and more				A	We commend Castle Point Borough Council for producing a Local Plan with clear ambitions to enhance biodiversity, strengthen green infrastructure, and address climate resilience. However, to ensure that the Plan delivers genuine nature recovery and meets the challenges ahead, we recommend strengthening several policies to better protect irreplaceable habitats, deliver higher environmental gains, and embed long-term tree strategy objectives.	Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												joined-up habitats in line with the Lawton principles, referencing the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). • Introducing a specific objective to protect and restore ancient woodland and veteran trees. 2. Biodiversity Net Gain (Policy ENV3) Castle Point proposes a 10 per cent Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for brownfield sites and 20 per cent for greenfield sites. This is encouraging, but to maximise ecological benefit: The Woodland Trust calls for: 2 • A minimum of 20 per cent BNG across all sites, not just greenfield, to reflect emerging best practice and ensure consistent nature recovery. • 50 years’ maintenance and monitoring of BNG sites, recognising the decades required for woodland habitats to mature. • Clear exclusion of ancient woodland and veteran trees from net gain calculations, in line with the Planners’ Manual’s recognition that loss of irreplaceable habitats always results in net biodiversity loss. We also support the use of the Urban Greening Factor (0.3 for major commercial and 0.4 for major residential schemes) but recommend expanding this into a Tree Equity Approach,1 ensuring greening efforts prioritise deprived and low-canopy areas. as outlined in the Tree							

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												Strategy Template. 3. Protection of Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees (Policy ENV1 & ENV3) The Plan correctly identifies ancient woodland as an irreplaceable habitat and references NPPF protections. However, stronger policy wording is essential: The Woodland Trust calls for: • Explicit adoption of the recommended NPPF policy wording (paragraph 193, subsection c): “Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons”. • Recognition that compensation cannot offset loss of ancient woodland or veteran trees. • Buffer zones: at least 50 metres for ancient woodland and 15x trunk diameter (or 5m beyond canopy) for veteran trees. • A proactive programme of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) for all ancient and veteran trees, and expansion of the Ancient Tree Inventory. 2 4. Tree Strategy and Canopy Cover Castle Point’s Plan recognises green infrastructure but lacks a comprehensive tree strategy. We recommend integrating a 16-year Tree and Woodland Action Plan, following our Tree Strategy Template: • 30 per cent canopy cover target							

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												for all new developments and 25 per cent canopy cover on council land by year 12. • Tree-lined streets as standard, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 136. • Mandatory use of UK and Ireland Sourced and Grown (UKISG)3 trees from appropriate seed zones. • Creation of local tree nurseries to strengthen biosecurity and provide local employment. • Adoption of Tree Equity Mapping to guide planting in deprived or low-canopy areas. 5. Hedgerows and Habitat Networks While hedgerows are noted in landscape policies, a dedicated hedgerow policy is required to: 1 https://uk.treeequityscore.org/ 2 https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/ 3 https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/we-plant-trees/uk-sourced-and-grown-scheme/ 3 • Recognise ancient hedgerows as irreplaceable features. • Apply a 10:1 replacement ratio for non-ancient hedgerow losses. • Require native, UKISG-compliant species for hedgerow planting and restoration. 6. Coastal, Landscape and Green Infrastructure Policies (ENV1 & ENV2) We support the Plan's ambition to protect Castle Point's distinctive landscapes and coastal							

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												habitats. To strengthen delivery: • Embed woodland and hedgerow connectivity into landscape assessments. • Integrate ecological corridors into the proposed Riverside Strategy. • Require nature-based solutions (e.g., wet woodland creation, riparian buffers) for climate resilience. 7. Monitoring and Enforcement A robust monitoring framework is essential to ensure policies translate into outcomes. We recommend: • Establishing a central database to track tree planting, canopy cover, and BNG delivery. • Annual public reporting on BNG compliance, canopy cover changes, and habitat connectivity. • Enforcement mechanisms for long-term stewardship of BNG and tree planting sites. Summary of Recommendations 1. BNG: Minimum 20 per cent across all sites, with 50-year management. 2. Canopy Cover: 30 per cent in new developments, 25 per cent on council land, with tree-lined streets. 3. Ancient Woodland & Veteran Trees: Adopt NPPF 193c policy wording; apply buffer standards; expand TPOs and Ancient Tree Inventory. 4. Tree Strategy: Implement a 16-year Tree and Woodland Action Plan with UKISG trees, local nurseries, and equity mapping. 5. Hedgerows: Introduce a dedicated policy with strong							

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												protection and replacement standards. 6. Landscape & Coastal Policies: Strengthen ecological connectivity and nature-based climate solutions. 7. Monitoring: Establish centralised data, annual reporting, and enforcement mechanisms.							

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0329-0004	Organisati on	Ben	Green	The Woo dland Trus t		ENV 1											Tree Strategy and Canopy Cover Castle Point's Plan recognises green infrastructure but lacks a comprehensive tree strategy. We recommend integrating a 16-year Tree and Woodland Action Plan, following our Tree Strategy Template: • 30 per cent canopy cover target for all new developments and 25 per cent canopy cover on council land by year 12. • Tree-lined streets as standard, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 136. • Mandatory use of UK and Ireland Sourced and Grown (UKISG)3 trees from appropriate seed zones. • Creation of local tree nurseries to strengthen biosecurity and provide local employment. • Adoption of Tree Equity Mapping to guide planting in deprived or low-	It should be noted that Policy D4(3) already requires new streets to be tree lined. Policy ENV3(d)(iii) commits to 'An urban greening factor score of 0.3 for all major commercial development proposals and 0.4 for all major residential development proposals, in line with the model Urban Greening Factor for England;'	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	canopy areas. Hedgerows and Habitat Networks While hedgerows are noted in landscape policies, a dedicated hedgerow policy is required to: 1 https://uk.treeequityscore.org/ 2 https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/ 3 https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/we-plant-trees/uk-sourced-and-grown-scheme/ 3 • Recognise ancient hedgerows as irreplaceable features. • Apply a 10:1 replacement ratio for non-ancient hedgerow losses. • Require native, UKISG-compliant species for hedgerow planting and restoration.		
0282-00	Organisation	Kevin	Frasier	Essex County Council	Yes	ENV 2	Not Stated		Yes		ECC welcomes reference in criteria 1 to working with ECC, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, and other partners to prepare a Riverside Strategy. ECC welcome reference in criteria 1a to TE2100 Plan		Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional	B	Welcomes criteria to work with ECC as Lead Flood Authority and partners to prepare a Riverside Strategy Welcomes reference to the	Accepted, no modifications Accepted , no modifications	5. Development proposals must be designed to

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
40											which allows for future seawall defence maintenance and construction.				al appendices containing various pieces of evidence		TE2100 Plan within the policy which allows for future seawall defences.		protect and enhance ~~enable~~ and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02690001	Organisation	Annie	Gordon	Essex Wildlife Trust	Not Stated	ENV2	Yes	Policy ENV2: Coastal & Riverside Strategy While we strongly support the policy's strategic objectives and multi-functional approach to coastal management, we object to Policy ENV2 in its current form as it fails to meet the tests of soundness required for examination. Fundamental gaps in implementation render the policy ineffective for protecting Castle Point's internationally important coastal habitats. 2	No	Effectiveness	The policy demonstrates a strong strategic vision and appropriately integrates with regional frameworks including the Thames Estuary 2100 Plan, the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy, and South Essex Estuary Park initiative. However, we have concerns that Policy ENV2 fails the effectiveness test due to critical implementation gaps. The policy's effectiveness depends entirely on preparation of a Riverside Strategy, yet no timeline, governance arrangements, or resource commitments are provided for this fundamental delivery mechanism. This creates a policy vacuum that could persist for some considerable time while leaving internationally important coastal habitats without adequate protection. During the potentially lengthy strategy preparation period, development proposals affecting coastal areas will lack clear guidance on biodiversity protection requirements. This is particularly problematic given that Castle Point's coastal areas contain Special Protection Areas and Special Areas of Conservation supporting nationally significant populations of wintering waterfowl and breeding	Suggested Amendments To address these fundamental concerns, we consider three critical amendments essential for the policy to be found sound. First, the policy should include a clear and binding timeline for Riverside Strategy completion, for example completion within two years of plan adoption, supported by defined partnership arrangements and resource commitments. Second, the policy should provide interim guidance for determining applications affecting coastal areas prior to strategy completion. This should include specific criteria for protecting coastal habitats, contributing to LNRS strategic opportunities, and ensuring flood defence improvements deliver biodiversity benefits alongside flood protection. Third, the policy should explicitly reference the specific coastal habitat types requiring protection, including coastal grazing marsh, mudflats, saltmarsh, and associated terrestrial habitats,	Not Stated		No	A	Essex Wildlife Trust comment on the following policies, including recommendations for mods. Policy ENV2: Coastal & Riverside Strategy Strongly support the policy's strategic objectives and multi-functional approach to coastal management, we object to Policy ENV2 in its current form as it fails to meet the tests of soundness required for examination. Fundamental gaps in implementation render the policy ineffective for protecting Castle Point's internationally important coastal habitats. Concerns that Policy ENV2 fails the effectiveness test due to critical implementation gaps. The policy's effectiveness depends entirely on preparation of a Riverside Strategy, yet no timeline, governance arrangements, or resource commitments are	Policy ENV2 - Comments noted, some of the concerns are already covered. Priority habitats are already protected by Policy ENV3. Part 6 of Policy ENV2 already covers much of the expressed concerns ' <i>Development proposals must ensure areas that are identified as an Area of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (APIBs) within the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) are protected and where possible enhanced.</i> ' However, the policy and text may benefit from more clarity and cross-references -	Policy ENV2 – Coastal & Riverside Strategy 1. Working with the Environment Agency, ECC Lead Local Flood Authority , neighbouring authorities, the community and other relevant stakeholders the Council will prepare a Riverside Strategy. The Riverside Strategy will: a. Looking across

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											birds. The policy lacks sufficient detail on how coastal habitat enhancement will be achieved and fails to acknowledge specific habitat types requiring protection. Castle Point's coastal grazing marshes, mudflats, and saltmarsh habitats are critical for wildlife and face increasing pressure from sea level rise, increasing recreational disturbance and development. These internationally important habitats need explicit protection measures that operate immediately rather than awaiting future strategy development. The policy also fails to establish clear partnership governance arrangements with Natural England, the Environment Agency and neighbouring authorities, despite acknowledging their essential role. Without defined roles, responsibilities, and resource commitments, there is no certainty that the Riverside Strategy will be delivered within any reasonable timeframe.							provided for this fundamental delivery mechanism. This creates a policy vacuum that could persist for some considerable time while leaving internationally important coastal habitats without adequate protection. During the potentially lengthy strategy preparation period, development proposals affecting coastal areas will lack clear guidance on biodiversity protection requirements. This is particularly problematic given that Castle Point's coastal areas contain Special Protection Areas and Special Areas of Conservation supporting nationally significant populations of wintering waterfowl and breeding birds. The policy lacks sufficient detail on how coastal habitat enhancement will be achieved and fails to acknowledge	see proposed mods.	administ rative boundari es, covering the Bowers Marshes , Canvey Island and Hadleigh Marshes Policy Unit areas as set out in the Thames Estuary 2100 Plan; b. Allow for and plan for improve ments to and manage ment of the flood defence s; c. Improve access to and enjoyme nt of the coast, creating cross boundar y links

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	specific habitat types requiring protection. Castle Point's coastal grazing marshes, mudflats, and saltmarsh habitats are critical for wildlife and face increasing pressure from sea level rise, increasing recreational disturbance and development. These internationally important habitats need explicit protection measures that operate immediately rather than awaiting future strategy development. The policy also fails to establish clear partnership governance arrangements with Natural England, the Environment Agency and neighbouring authorities, despite acknowledging their essential role. Without defined roles, responsibilities, and resource commitments, there is no certainty that the Riverside Strategy will be delivered within any		where possible ; d. Enhance the cultural and social value of the coastal areas; and e. Enhance the ecological network s along the coast and coastal habitats. 2. Proposal s will not be supporte d where they conflict with the aims of the Riversid e Strategy. 3. Proposal s which deliver the

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	reasonable timeframe. Suggested Amendments: To address these fundamental concerns, we consider three critical amendments essential for the policy to be found sound. First, the policy should include a clear and binding timeline for Riverside Strategy completion, for example completion within two years of plan adoption, supported by defined partnership arrangements and resource commitments. Second, the policy should provide interim guidance for determining applications affecting coastal areas prior to strategy completion. This should include specific criteria for protecting coastal habitats, contributing to LNRS strategic opportunities, and ensuring flood defence		multi- function al green and blue infrastru cture recomm endation s of the South Essex Estuary Park (SEE Park) will be supporte d. 4. Be subject to a Habitats Regulati ons Assessm ent in order to demonst rate no adverse effects on site integrity. 5. Develop ment proposal s must be designed to enable and support the

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	improvements deliver biodiversity benefits alongside flood protection. Third, the policy should explicitly reference the specific coastal habitat types requiring protection, including coastal grazing marsh, mudflats, saltmarsh, and associated terrestrial habitats, providing immediate clarity on biodiversity priorities while the detailed strategy is being developed.		habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). 6. Development proposals must ensure areas that are identified as an Area of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (APIBs) within the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			(LNRS), and priority habitats such as coastal floodpla in grazing marsh, mudflat s and coastal saltmar sh are protecte d and where possible enhance d. 7. Proposa ls for flood defence improve ments should seek to deliver biodiver sity benefits alongsid e flood protecti on. 18.15 It is importan t for future generati ons that

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			new develop ment does not hamper the delivery of the Riversid e Strategy, and to this end, it will be a material planning consider ation when determin ing applicati ons within the vicinity of the coast. Coastal and riverside areas are subject to environ mental protecti on under element s 3-7 of policy ENV2, as

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			well as other policies within the plan, which provide assurance of their appropriate consideration and protection on the interim period prior to the publication of the Riverside Strategy .
0 3 4 1 - 0 0 1 5	Organisati on	Jan et	Nutt al	Nat ural Eng alnd		ENV 2	Yes	Natural England welcomes the strategic approach set out in Policy ENV2 with regards to coastal management and will review the Riverside Strategy HRA when this is available. We would encourage Castle Point to explore potential nature-based solutions to coastal and flood management as these can create opportunities for environmental enhancement that may help to mitigate any potential impacts on protected sites or act as	Ye s							A	Natural England welcomes the strategic approach set out in Policy ENV2 with regards to coastal management and will review the Riverside Strategy HRA when this is available. We would encourage Castle Point to explore potential nature-based solutions to coastal and flood management as	Support noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								compensatory measures should these be required.									these can create opportunities for environmental enhancement that may help to mitigate any potential impacts on protected sites or act as compensatory measures should these be required.		
1 0 1 2 - 0 0 0 8	Agent	Arun	Sriskanda	Oikos Storage Ltd c/o Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd	Yes	ENV2	Yes		No	Effective	Oikos consider that the policy as currently drafted is ineffective and therefore unsound as it does not acknowledge the strategic importance of the port and other employment facilities located along the river. Any strategy that relates to the coastal and riverside areas of the borough should take due account of such land uses and should be worded appropriately. 35. Oikos notes the Council's intention to work with the EA, ECC, lead local flood authority, neighbouring authorities and the community to prepare the Strategy. Further to the point made above and Oikos' operational infrastructure being located both adjacent to and extending into the River Thames, Oikos would politely request that they are involved as appropriate in the drafting of the strategy.	Oikos would politely request that the wording of the policy is amended to include appropriate references to the port and other employment facilities within the coastal and riverside area.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Oikos consider that the policy as currently drafted is ineffective and therefore unsound as it does not acknowledge the strategic importance of the port and other employment facilities located along the river. Any strategy that relates to the coastal and riverside areas of the borough should take due account of such land uses and should be worded appropriately. Oikos notes the Council's intention to work with the EA, ECC, lead local flood authority, neighbouring authorities and the community to prepare the Strategy. Further to the point made above and Oikos'	The Plan should be read as a whole and Port Facilities are covered by Policy C3, for which the supporting text acknowledges that they 'are nationally significant and have a role to play in ensuring the security of energy supplies in the UK.' Therefore, it is considered that there strategic importance is already recognised within the Plan. Policy element 1 sets out that the Strategy	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	operational infrastructure being located both adjacent to and extending into the River Thames, Oikos would politely request that they are involved as appropriate in the drafting of the strategy. Oikos would politely request that the wording of the policy is amended to include appropriate references to the port and other employment facilities within the coastal and riverside area.	will involve relevant stakeholders.	
0 3 2 3 - 0 0 0 8	Organisati on	Mic hae l	Atki ns	Port of Lon don Auth ority		ENV 2										A	<u>Policy ENV2 – Coastal & Riverside Strategy:</u> To confirm the PLA must also be included as part of the councils proposal to prepare a Riverside Strategy for the borough. Related to this consideration should also be given as to whether the policy should include reference to the Estuary Edges guidance which presents a ‘how to’ guide for developers on ecological design	Mods proposed	Policy ENV2 – Coastal & Riverside Strategy 1. Working with the Environment Agency, ECC Lead Local Flood Authority , neighbouring

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	for softening these 'edges' to encourage wildlife into urban estuaries. (About - Estuary Edges - The Thames Estuary Partnership).		authorities, the community, the Port of London Authority and other relevant stakeholders the Council will prepare a Riversid e Strategy.
1 4 4 0 - 0 0 1 8	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	ENV 2	Yes		No	Justified	The RSPB welcomes e) enhancing networks , and the mention of the Essex LNRS guidelines and APIBs. Recreational disturbance needs to feature in this Policy. Policy needs to ensure that any organised activities that have the potential to damage or disturb the designated features of the SPA/RAMSAR/SSSI are mitigated for and covered by an HRA. There is the option to explore opportunities for coastal adaptation measures and Beneficial Use of Dredged Sediment (BUDS), for example saline lagoon creation. Enhancing coastal areas for biodiversity should be specified.	Policy ENV2 should specify the need to address recreational disturbance and to ensure that any organised activities that have the potential to damage or disturb the designated features of the SPA/RAMSAR/SSSI are mitigated for and covered by an HRA. It is suggested to add wording such as: "Explore opportunities for coastal adaptation measures and Beneficial Use of Dredged Sediment (BUDS), for example through saline lagoon creation. Policy should specifically include reference to enhancing coastal areas for biodiversity.	No				The RSPB welcomes e) enhancing networks , and the mention of the Essex LNRS guidelines and APIBs. Recreational disturbance needs to feature in this Policy. Policy needs to ensure that any organised activities that have the potential to damage or disturb the designated features of the SPA/RAMSAR/SSSI are mitigated for and covered by an HRA. There is the option to explore opportunities for coastal adaptation	Recreational disturbance and RAMS is covered in policy ENV3. Policy ENV2 parts 5 and 6 cover biodiversity, please see proposed mods	6. Develop ment proposals must ensure areas that are identified as an Area of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (APIBs) within the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	measures and Beneficial Use of Dredged Sediment (BUDS), for example saline lagoon creation. Enhancing coastal areas for biodiversity should be specified. Policy ENV2 should specify the need to address recreational disturbance and to ensure that any organised activities that have the potential to damage or disturb the designated features of the SPA/RAMSAR/SSSI are mitigated for and covered by an HRA. It is suggested to add wording such as: "Explore opportunities for coastal adaptation measures and Beneficial Use of Dredged Sediment (BUDS), for example through saline lagoon creation. Policy should specifically include reference to enhancing coastal areas for biodiversity.		(LNRS), and priority habitats such as coastal floodplains in grazing marsh, mudflats and coastal saltmarsh are protected and where possible enhanced. 7. Proposals for flood defence improvements should seek to deliver biodiversity benefits alongside flood protection.

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0329-0005	Organisation	Ben	Green	The Woodland Trust		ENV2											Coastal, Landscape and Green Infrastructure Policies (ENV1 & ENV2) We support the Plan's ambition to protect Castle Point's distinctive landscapes and coastal habitats. To strengthen delivery: • Embed woodland and hedgerow connectivity into landscape assessments. • Integrate ecological corridors into the proposed Riverside Strategy. • Require nature-based solutions (e.g., wet woodland creation, riparian buffers) for climate resilience.	Policy D4 Landscaping is explicit that trees, native species and integrated habitats are important. Policy ENV2 is clear that Development proposals must be designed to enable and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). <u>Modification to Policy ENV1(2)</u> Policy ENV1(2) Development proposals should seek to protect, ~~and~~ enhance and increase the connectivity of key natural/semi-natural and historical features including:	Y - Modification to Policy ENV1(2) Policy ENV1(2) Development proposals should seek to protect, and enhance and increase the connectivity of key natural/semi-natural and historical

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		features including:	
1448-0007	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular Architecture	Not Stated	ENV 2	Not Stated		Not Stated		Coastlines should be reclassified as SSSIs, especially where the economic potential is not being fully realised, such as Coastal Towns with underused Beaches, such as Southport in Sefton as one example for other LAs.		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Coastlines should be reclassified as SSSIs, especially underused beaches like Southport in Sefton.	Noted	N
0823-0013	Organisation	Pat	Abbott	Environment Agency	Yes	ENV3	Yes		Yes		Paragraph 18.29 - We feel this is a strong policy overall and particularly welcome the inclusion of the requirement for the delivery of 20% BNG on greenfield sites. We feel the policy and reasoned justification could be strengthened further through the inclusion of reference to measures that would contribute to Water Framework Directive objectives for developments adjacent to watercourses. This could include promoting opportunities for riverbank naturalisation, the removal of in-channel structures, de-culverting of piped watercourses, and riparian zone enhancements. Plans for development adjacent to or encompassing a watercourse should include a minimum 10 m buffer zone along both sides of the		No	Not Answered		A	Strong support for this policy, the EA feels the reasoned justification could be strengthened by referring to Water Framework Directive objectives for developments adjacent to watercourses. This could include promoting opportunities for riverbank naturalisation, the removal of in-channel structures, de-culverting of piped watercourses, and riparian zone enhancements. Plans for development adjacent to or encompassing a watercourse should include a minimum	Noted, see modifications	18.29 The Environment Act 2021 introduced Biodiversity Net Gain. This mandates that most developments should deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain, using a specific metric developed by the

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											watercourse to create a corridor of land and water favourable to the enhancement of biodiversity.						10 m buffer zone along both sides of the watercourse to create a corridor of land and water favourable to the enhancement of biodiversity.		Government. Local areas can set a higher requirement through their plans where it can be demonstrated it would be deliverable. Viability testing has indicated it is possible to secure 20% biodiversity net gain on greenfield sites, and this requirement has been set for those sites to improve local contribution to the local Nature Recover

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			y network identifie d through the Local Nature Recover y Strategy for Essex. For develop ments adjacent to waterco urses the Water Framew ork Objectiv es should be utilised.

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2 6 9 - 0 0 0 2	Organisati on	An nie	Gor don	Esse x Wild life Trus t	Not State d	ENV 3	Yes	Policy ENV3: Securing Nature Recovery and Biodiversity Net Gain We conditionally support Policy ENV3, recognising its strong ambitions for biodiversity protection and enhancement in Castle Point. The policy demonstrates good alignment with national policy requirements and exceeds minimum biodiversity net gain standards through its 20% requirement on greenfield sites. The policy appropriately recognises that the statutory framework under the Environment Act 2021 provides the implementation mechanisms for biodiversity net gain, including automatic conditions, enforcement powers, and 30-year maintenance requirements. The policy meets the tests for being positively prepared and consistent with national policy. We particularly welcome the integration with Essex-wide strategies including the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and the Essex Coast Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. The policy appropriately recognises the biodiversity hierarchy and implements Habitats Regulations requirements, while incorporating relevant statutory duties under the	Ye s		The policy demonstrates good justification for its higher biodiversity net gain requirements, with clear rationale based on viability testing and appropriate differentiation between brownfield and greenfield sites. We strongly support the ambitious approach of requiring 20% biodiversity net gain on greenfield sites, which reflects Castle Point's important role in the wider Essex nature recovery network.	However, we have concerns regarding the policy's long-term effectiveness in three key areas that require strengthening to ensure the policy fully meets the effectiveness test for soundness. Key Areas Requiring Amendment We have identified three critical improvements necessary for the policy to be fully effective. First, the identification of only two preferred sites for off-site biodiversity net gain provision may be insufficient to meet likely demand over the plan period. Additional strategic sites should be identified to prevent delivery bottlenecks that could undermine the policy's objectives. The policy should include a commitment to regularly review and expand the list of preferred off-site sites based on demand and availability. Second, the policy lacks clear criteria for selecting future off-site biodiversity net gain sites. Establishing transparent selection criteria would provide certainty for developers and landowners while ensuring sites contribute effectively to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy objectives. These criteria should prioritise sites that will enhance ecological connectivity, are capable of supporting priority habitats and species, and will contribute to landscape-scale nature recovery. Third,	Not Sta ted		No	A	Conditionally support ENV3. The policy demonstrates good alignment with national policy requirements and recognises the statutory framework under the Environment Act 2021 provides the implementation mechanisms for biodiversity net gain, including automatic conditions, enforcement powers, and 30-year maintenance requirements. The policy meets the tests for being positively prepared and consistent with national policy. We particularly welcome the integration with Essex-wide strategies including the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and the Essex Coast Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. The policy appropriately recognises the biodiversity hierarchy and implements	Mods proposed to address the concerns	Y 18.31 The Castle Point Green and Blue Infrastru cture Strategy and Open Space Assessm ent have both consider ed a number of sites across Castle Point for their potential suitabilit y for off- site biodiver sity net gain. Of those sites that have been assesse d as having significa nt potential biodiver sity enhance

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.				while the policy references the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy, it could strengthen the integration between biodiversity net gain delivery and LNRS implementation. The policy should explicitly encourage biodiversity net gain provision in LNRS opportunity areas and consider how strategic significance multipliers could incentivise habitat creation in locations that maximise benefits for nature recovery. Recommended Policy Additions To address these concerns, we recommend adding text to commit the Council to maintaining an up-to-date list of preferred off-site biodiversity net gain sites, with regular reviews to ensure adequate provision. The policy should include criteria for site selection focusing on ecological connectivity, priority habitat creation, and alignment with Local Nature Recovery Strategy objectives. Additionally, the policy should explicitly encourage off-site biodiversity net gain provision within LNRS opportunity areas and consider how the strategic significance multiplier can be used to direct habitat creation to locations that maximise landscape-scale conservation benefits. Protected Species Considerations We welcome the policy's recognition of					Habitats Regulations requirements, while incorporating relevant statutory duties under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. 3 The policy demonstrates good justification for its higher biodiversity net gain requirements, with clear rationale based on viability testing and appropriate differentiation between brownfield and greenfield sites. We strongly support the ambitious approach of requiring 20% biodiversity net gain on greenfield sites, which reflects Castle Point's important role in the wider Essex nature recovery network. However, we have concerns regarding the policy's long-term effectiveness in three key areas that require		ment and are either owned by the Council or have been promoted for inclusion in the Plan for biodiversity, are identified as the first tranche of preferred offsite biodiversity net gain sites. The need for further off-site biodiversity net gain sites will be kept under review and the preferred list expanded further, in

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												protected species but recommend strengthening provisions for badger protection. Castle Point has a notable badger population, and development pressure increasingly creates conflicts between badgers and residents when animals access gardens and cause damage through foraging activities. This issue is exacerbated by new developments encroaching on traditional badger territories. We developed a Badger Protection Plan in collaboration with Castle Point Borough Council in 2020, which provides comprehensive guidance for addressing these challenges. The policy should reference this guidance and require badger protection plans for developments within 1km of known badger setts. Key mitigation measures should include maintaining habitat connectivity through wildlife corridors, implementing appropriate fencing specifications to guide badger movement away from vulnerable areas, and ensuring development design minimises habitat fragmentation. Effective badger mitigation requires early assessment of badger activity, coordination with neighbouring developments to avoid cumulative impacts, and long-term monitoring to ensure protection measures					strengthening to ensure the policy fully meets the effectiveness test for soundness. ENV3 - Key Areas Requiring Amendment We have identified three critical improvements necessary for the policy to be fully effective. First, the identification of only two preferred sites for off-site biodiversity net gain provision may be insufficient to meet likely demand over the plan period. Additional strategic sites should be identified to prevent delivery bottlenecks that could undermine the policy's objectives. The policy should include a commitment to regularly review and expand the list of preferred off-site sites based on demand and availability. Second, the policy lacks clear criteria for selecting future off-site biodiversity net gain sites.		respons e to demand and availabil ity.

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												remain effective. The policy could be strengthened by explicitly requiring compliance with the Essex Wildlife Trust Badger Protection Plan guidance where badger territories may be affected by development.					Establishing transparent selection criteria would provide certainty for developers and landowners while ensuring sites contribute effectively to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy objectives. These criteria should prioritise sites that will enhance ecological connectivity, are capable of supporting priority habitats and species, and will contribute to landscape-scale nature recovery. Third, while the policy references the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy, it could strengthen the integration between biodiversity net gain delivery and LNRS implementation. The policy should explicitly encourage biodiversity net gain provision in LNRS opportunity areas and consider how strategic significance multipliers could		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	incentivise habitat creation in locations that maximise benefits for nature recovery. Recommended Policy Additions To address these concerns, we recommend adding text to commit the Council to maintaining an up-to-date list of preferred off-site biodiversity net gain sites, with regular reviews to ensure adequate provision. The policy should include criteria for site selection focusing on ecological connectivity, priority habitat creation, and alignment with Local Nature Recovery Strategy objectives. Additionally, the policy should explicitly encourage off-site biodiversity net gain provision within LNRS opportunity areas and consider how the strategic significance multiplier can be used to direct habitat creation to		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	locations that maximise landscape-scale conservation benefits. Protected Species Considerations We welcome the policy's recognition of protected species but recommend strengthening provisions for badger protection. Castle Point has a notable badger population, and development pressure increasingly creates conflicts between badgers and residents when animals access gardens and cause damage through foraging activities. This issue is exacerbated by new developments encroaching on traditional badger territories. We developed a Badger Protection Plan in collaboration with Castle Point Borough Council in 2020, which provides comprehensive guidance for addressing these challenges. The		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	policy should reference this guidance and require badger protection plans for developments within 1km of known badger setts. Key mitigation measures should include maintaining habitat connectivity through wildlife corridors, implementing appropriate fencing specifications to guide badger movement away from vulnerable areas, and ensuring development design minimises habitat fragmentation. Effective badger mitigation requires early assessment of badger activity, coordination with neighbouring developments to avoid cumulative impacts, and long-term monitoring to ensure protection measures remain effective. The policy could be strengthened by explicitly requiring compliance with the Essex Wildlife Trust Badger Protection Plan guidance		

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	where badger territories may be affected by development.		
0343-0009	Agent	Ben	Weedall	Gladman Developments Ltd		ENV 3	Not Stated	This policy will require all major development to achieve minimum biodiversity net gain of 20%. Gladman do not consider it sound for a higher requirement to be placed over and above the national policy requirement of 10%. 4.1.2 In considering the soundness of this policy it is necessary to consider paragraph 74-006-20240214	No		Gladman does not consider that the evidence used to justify this approach is sufficiently robust and as such 10% should be the requirement.					B	Comment on BNG and evidence for 20%.	As set out in paragraph 18.29 'The Environment Act 2021 introduced Biodiversity Net Gain. This mandates that most developments should	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								of PPG which states that: “... plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% biodiversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development unless justified. To justify such policies, they will need to be evidenced including as to local need for a higher percentage, local opportunities for a higher percentage and any impacts on viability for development. Consideration will also need to be given to how the policy will be implemented”										<i>deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain, using a specific metric developed by the Government. Local areas can set a higher requirement through their plans where it can be demonstrated it would be deliverable. Viability testing has indicated it is possible to secure 20% biodiversity net gain on greenfield sites, and this requirement has been set for those sites to improve local contribution to the local Nature Recovery</i>	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		<i>network identified through the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Essex.'</i>	
1 0 2 0 - 0 0 0 6	Organisati on	Ma rk	Behr endt	Ho me Buil ders Fed erati on	Yes	EN V3	No	See comments on DtC and SA	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Part 1a of this policy states it will seek to secure nature recovery and biodiversity net gain by “Applying the principles related to the biodiversity hierarchy, Sites of Special Scientific interests (SSSI) and irreplaceable habitats set out in national planning policy. In Castle Point, ancient woodlands are considered to constitute irreplaceable habitats”. HBF are concerned that in putting consideration of the biodiversity hierarchy along-side the consideration of irreplaceable habitats the will create confusion in the application of this policy. The delivery of BNG is a separate and different consideration to those related to protected species and habitats and should be kept separate within policies. HBF would therefore recommend that mention of the biodiversity hierarchy is removed from part 1a. HBF does not consider the requirement in 2d for development on greenfield sites to deliver 20% BNG to		Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	Part 1a of this policy states it will seek to secure nature recovery and biodiversity net gain by “Applying the principles related to the biodiversity hierarchy, Sites of Special Scientific interests (SSSI) and irreplaceable habitats set out in national planning policy. In Castle Point, ancient woodlands are considered to constitute irreplaceable habitats”. HBF are concerned that in putting consideration of the biodiversity hierarchy along-side the consideration of irreplaceable habitats the will create confusion in the application of this policy. The delivery of BNG is a separate and different consideration to	Biodiversity hierarchy comment noted. BNG: As set out in paragraph 18.29 'Local areas can set a higher requirement through their plans where it can be demonstrated it would be deliverable. Viability testing has indicated it is possible to secure 20% biodiversity net gain on greenfield sites The 20% BNG target aligns with the wider Essex ambitions for 20% Biodiversity Net Gain to support nature	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											be sound. Guidance in paragraph 74-006-20240214 of PPG states that: “... plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% bio-diversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development un-less justified. To justify such policies, they will need to be evidenced including as to local need for a higher percentage, local opportunities for a higher percentage and any impacts on viability for development. Consideration will also need to be given to how the policy will be implemented”. As such the starting point is that local plan should not seek a higher requirement. This is different to a per-missive policy allowing local plans to seek a higher level of BNG where justified, and the HBF would argue that it should be considered a high bar with regard to the evidence required to justify such a policy. There must be very robust evidence that the area is significantly worse than the country as whole with regard to the negative impacts on biodiversity from development. The HBF does not disagree with the broad thrust that the UK has seen a significant loss in biodiversity not just in						those related to protected species and habitats and should be kept separate within policies. HBF would therefore recommend that mention of the biodiversity hierarchy is removed from part 1a. Objects to BNG 20% requirment and the evidence for it.	recovery and delivery of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Essex'. 20% is supported by Natural England and the results of the Plan Reg 18 consultation. It has also been subject to viability testing.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											recent past but previous centuries and as such recognise the importance of ensuring that the outcome of new development in future is that there is a net gain in biodiversity. However, it is important to recognise that in recent years new residential development has not been the driver of declining biodiversity either locally or nationally and in particular over the last 50 years. The main drivers of declining biodiversity in England, as outlined in the State of Nature Report 2023 (State of Nature Partnership, 2023), as being “Intensive management of agricultural land, largely driven by policies and incentives since World War II, has been identified as the most significant factor driving species’ population change in the UK”. Therefore, whilst it is important for development to ensure that it improves the natural environment, it is not the main driver of biodiversity decline in Essex or Castle Point. Given that the Government has stated that plan makers should not seek to apply a higher level of BNG it is clearly insufficient to simply state that a 20% BNG requirement is needed in CPDC without the evidence to show why new									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development is having a greater impact on biodiversity in Castle Point compared to other parts of the country. The Council is seeking to require new development to offset the impacts of biodiversity created by the practices of other industries. This is unsound and inconsistent with paragraph 58 of the NPPF and the tests as to when a planning obligation can be sought. Given that 10% net gain is considered by Government as to what is required to address the harm to biodiversity arising from that development there can be no justification for requiring a developer to go beyond that. 43. With regard to viability, the Council’s Viability Assessment (VA) states that it has based its cost on the Viability Assessment produced by Essex County Council and assumes the average cost of delivering 10% BNG to be £1000 per dwelling on green field sites and £450 per dwelling on PDL. These have been uplifted by £300 on green field sites to reflect the requirement to deliver 20% BNG. The Viability Assessment shows that on the basis of these costs green field sites can deliver 20% BNG. The difficult with assessments as to the cost of meeting BNG is that every								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											site is different and until the baseline level of biodiversity is known the cost of meeting either 10% or 20% is not known. Therefore, if it is considered to be sound to place this bur-den on developers there must be scope for this to be reduced where it is a barrier to delivery. HBF therefore suggests that this policy or SP4 on developer contributions is amended to state that where a development is made unviable by the cost of meeting the 20% BNG requirement, on its own or in combination with other costs, this will be reduced to the statutory minimum.								
0332-0005	Agent	Corin	Williams	Icen i OBO The Inne r Lon don Gro up		ENV 3	No	Similarly to the response to Policy ENV1, Policy ENV3 and its requirement for greenfield developments to deliver a 20% biodiversity uplift is considered to put a significant strain on the deliverability of schemes and will inevitably stop them coming forward.	No	Positively Prepared	Inner London would like to ask when evidence justifying this position will be published and whether this option has been fully viability tested. Without this supporting evidence the policy is unsound on the ground of it stifling development and therefore not being positively prepared.					B	<u>Policy ENV3 – Securing Nature Recovery and Biodiversity Net Gain</u> Similarly to the response to Policy ENV1, Policy ENV3 and its requirement for greenfield developments to deliver a 20% biodiversity uplift is considered to put a significant strain on the deliverability of schemes and will inevitably stop them coming forward.	As set out in paragraph 18.29 'Local areas can set a higher requirement through their plans where it can be demonstrated it would be deliverable. Viability testing has indicated it is possible to secure 20% biodiversity net gain on	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	Inner London would like to ask when evidence justifying this position will be published and whether this option has been fully viability tested. Without this supporting evidence the policy is unsound on the ground of it stifling development and therefore not being positively prepared.	greenfield sites, and this requirement has been set for those sites to improve local contribution to the local Nature Recovery network identified through the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Essex'.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0341-0016	Organisation	Janet	Nuttall	Natural England		ENV3	Yes	We agree that ‘Where appropriate, large scale residential developments within the Zones of Influence will be required to provide sustainable accessible natural greenspace (SANG) or SANG-like provision’. This should be defined as providing a minimum of 8Ha per 1000 new population of accessible semi-natural greenspace with a minimum 2.7km circular walk on-site or on-site and making use of the existing Public Rights of Way network. Note that the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) is in the process of being updated (section 18.23) and the supporting text should refer to future iterations of this strategy. We are pleased to see reference to SSSIs. Given point 1a covers irreplaceable habitats and SSSIs, should it refer to the mitigation hierarchy rather than the biodiversity hierarchy which prioritises steps for BNG delivery (onsite first, offsite, and statutory credits as a last resort)? We welcome point 1d(ii) and the 20% target for development on greenfield land. This aligns with the wider Essex ambitions for 20% Biodiversity Net Gain to support nature recovery and	Yes							A	We agree that ‘Where appropriate, large scale residential developments within the Zones of Influence will be required to provide sustainable accessible natural greenspace (SANG) or SANG like provision’. This should be defined as providing a minimum of 8Ha per 1000 new population of accessible semi-natural greenspace with a minimum 2.7km circular walk on-site or on-site and making use of the existing Public Rights of Way network. Note that the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) is in the	<u>Modification : Addition to Policy ENV3 paragraph 1a and b</u> a. Applying the principles related to the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy, Sites of Special Scientific interests (SSSI) and irreplaceable habitats set out in national planning policy, ~~in~~ Castle Point , including ancient woodlands ~~are considered to constitute irreplaceable habitats~~ b. Where appropriate, large scale residential developme	<u>Modification: Addition to Policy ENV3 paragraph 1a and b</u> a. Applying the principles related to the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy, Sites of Special Scientific interest s (SSSI) and irreplaceable habitat s set out in nationa l plannin g policy, ~~in~~

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								delivery of the LNRS. We welcome the inclusion of an Urban Greening Factor in the Plan. The UGF can work alongside BNG, ensuring that developments provide a biodiversity / greening uplift even where the BNG baseline is low. Public realm improvements (as noted in para 16.15) would also offer urban greening opportunities for Castle Point.									process of being updated (section 18.23) and the supporting text should refer to future iterations of this strategy. We are pleased to see reference to SSSIs. Given point 1a covers irreplaceable habitats and SSSIs, should it refer to the mitigation hierarchy rather than the biodiversity hierarchy which prioritises steps for BNG delivery (onsite first, offsite, and statutory credits as a last resort)? We welcome point 1d(ii) and the 20% target for development on greenfield land. This aligns with the wider Essex ambitions for 20% Biodiversity Net Gain to support nature recovery and delivery of the LNRS.	nts (500 units + or equivalent) within the Essex Coast Zone of Influence will be required to provide sustainable Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) or SANG-like provision. This should be defined as providing a minimum of 8Ha per 1,000 new population of accessible semi-natural greenspace with a minimum 2.3km circular walk on-site. Alternatively, developments may be able to contribute	Castle Point, including ancient woodlands are considered to constitute irreplaceable habitats b. Where appropriate, large scale residential developments (500 units + or equivalent) within the Essex Coast Zone of Influence will be required to

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	We welcome the inclusion of an Urban Greening Factor in the Plan. The UGF can work alongside BNG, ensuring that developments provide a biodiversity / greening uplift even where the BNG baseline is low. Public realm improvements (as noted in para 16.15) would also offer urban greening opportunities for Castle Point.	to the uplift an existing greenspace (e.g. a Country Park) to SANG standard. and making use of the existing Public Rights-of-Way network. <u>Modification : Paragraph 18.23</u> 18.23 A Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) has been prepared for the Essex Coast Habitats Sites to address this cooperatively across Essex.	provide sustainable Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) or SANG-like provision. This should be defined as providing a minimum of 8Ha per 1,000 new population of accessible semi-natural greenspace with a minimum 2.3km circul

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		This, together with any future updated iterations, sets out a series of actions to be taken to avoid adverse in-combination effects upon Essex Coast Habitats Sites to these habitats. The Strategy identifies a Zone of Influence (ZOI) around each Habitats sites in Essex where recreational disturbance is likely to result from residential development. Modification : Merge	ar walk on-site. Alternatively , developments may be able to contribute to the uplift an existing greenspace (e.g. a Country Park) to SANG standard. and making use of the existing Public Rights of Way network. <u>Modification:</u> <u>Paragr</u>

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Paragraph 18.24 into 18.23 together as they both address RAMs. This allows for the creation of a new paragraph 18.24 to address SANG (see below) New para: 18.24: The RAMS tariff addresses in-combination adverse effects on the integrity of the Essex Coast Habitats Sites. However, large sites (500+) with alone adverse effects from recreational disturbance will also need to	<u>aph 18.23</u> 18.23 A Recreational ~~d~~Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) has been prepared for the Essex Coast Habitats Sites to address this cooperatively across Essex. This, together with any future updated iterations, sets

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		mitigate via on-site SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace) provision, as recommended by Natural England. SANGs are areas that are designated with the aim of protecting ecologically sensitive protected sites like Special Protection Area (SPA) from recreational pressures by providing alternative green space for people to visit. SANG need to conform to the latest Natural	out a series of actions to be taken to avoid adverse in-combination effects upon Essex Coast Habitats Sites to these habitats. The Strategy identifies a Zone of Influence (ZOI) around each Habitats sites in Essex where recreational disturbance is

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		England SANG guidelines (add link to SANG guidelines on CPBC website). Where SANG or equivalent is provided, the RAMs tariff still applies, because in such cases, the Essex RAMS tariff mitigates for residual effect of these large sites, as no amount of on-site greenspace will prevent all visits to the coast, nor is that desirable. <u>New addition to Glossary</u> SANG	likely to result from residential development. Modification: Merge Paragraph 18.24 into 18.23 together as they both address RAMs. This allows for the creation of a new paragraph 18.24 to address SANG (see below) New para: 18.24:

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		(Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspac e) - A strategically planned high quality naturalistic green space designed to draw recreational visitors away from ecologically sensitive protected sites such as SPAs (Special Protection Areas), thereby reducing developme nt impacts. SANGs may include green or blue infrastruct ure and serve a multi- functional role, for example: provision of SuDS,	The RAMS tariff addres ses in- combi nation advers e effects on the integri ty of the Essex Coast Habita ts Sites. Howev er, large sites (500+) with alone advers e effects from recrea tional distur bance will also need to mitigat e via on-site SANG (Suita

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		climate change mitigation and enhancing public health and wellbeing.	ble Altern ative Natura l Green space) provisi on, as recom mende d by Natura l Engla nd. SANG s are areas that are design ated with the aim of protec ting ecolog ically sensiti ve protec ted sites like Specia l Protec tion Area (SPA) from

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			recrea tional pressu res by provid ing alterna tive green space for people to visit. SANG need to confor m to the latest Natura l Engla nd SANG guideli nes (add link to SANG guideli nes on CPBC websit e). Where SANG or equiva lent is provid ed, the

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			RAMs tariff still applies, because in such cases, the Essex RAMS tariff mitigates for residual effect of these large sites, as no amount of on-site greenspace will prevent all visits to the coast, nor is that desirable. <u>Related</u> <u>Conse</u> <u>quent</u>

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			<u>Mods</u> Relate d Conse quent Mods require d to Policy C1 and Thun2, as set out in the Sched ule of Mods and teh Natural Englan d Sattem ent of Comm on Groun d. <u>New additio n to Glossa ry</u> SANG (Suita ble Altern ative Natura l Green

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			space) - A strate gically planne d high quality natura listic green space design ed to draw recrea tional visitor s away from ecolog ically sensiti ve protec ted sites such as SPAs (Speci al Protec tion Areas) , thereb y reduci ng develo pment impact s.

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			SANG s may includ e green or blue infrast ructur e and serve a multi- functi onal role, for examp le: provisi on of SuDS, climat e chang e mitigat ion and enhan cing public health and wellbe ing.
0 9 8 8 - 0 0	Agent			Pers imm on Ho mes Ltd c/o Peg	Yes	EN V3	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	7.1. The requirement to deliver 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) on greenfield sites is not supported, as the policy currently allows for no flexibility for instances where this cannot be achieved – and no policy		Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	The requirement to deliver 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) on greenfield sites is not supported, as the policy currently allows for no	As set out in paragraph 18.29 'Local areas can set a higher requirement through their plans where it	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 7				asus Gro up							benefit for achieving this over-provision. The legislative requirement is for 10% BNG. The Council has provided no evidence of the benefit arising from a requirement in local policy that seeks more than the legislative minimum of 10%, nor has it considered the viability implications on sites. The Council should also bear in mind the effect that a higher BNG requirement would have on the number of homes sites are able to deliver, meaning additional allocations may be needed to deliver the target growth requirement. This also conflicts with provisions made elsewhere in the new Plan for sites to make an efficient use of available land and deliver as many homes as possible.						flexibility for instances where this cannot be achieved – and no policy benefit for achieving this over-provision. The legislative requirement is for 10% BNG. The Council has provided no evidence of the benefit arising from a requirement in local policy that seeks more than the legislative minimum of 10%, nor has it considered the viability implications on sites. The Council should also bear in mind the effect that a higher BNG requirement would have on the number of homes sites are able to deliver, meaning additional allocations may be needed to deliver the target growth requirement. This also conflicts with provisions made elsewhere in the new Plan for sites to make an efficient use of available land and deliver as many homes as possible.	can be demonstrated it would be deliverable. Viability testing has indicated it is possible to secure 20% biodiversity net gain on greenfield sites, and this requirement has been set for those sites to improve local contribution to the local Nature Recovery network identified through the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Essex'.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 4 4 0 - 0 0 1 9	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	ENV 3	Yes		Ye s		We welcome this Policy.	We welcome this Policy. We suggest that the possible development of a biodiversity enhancement toolkit for developments could prove useful.	No				We welcome this Policy. We suggest that the possible development of a biodiversity enhancement toolkit for developments could prove useful.	Noted	N
1 0 2 7 - 0 0 0 6	Agent	c/o age nt	c/o age nt	Tayl or Wim pey	Yes	EN V3	Yes		No	Effective, Justified	Paragraph d (ii) of Policy ENV3 is not national guidance. Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 74-006- 20240214 of the PPG states that “plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% biodiversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development unless justified”. To justify such policies they will need to be evidenced including as to local need for a higher percentage, local opportunities for a higher percentage and any impacts on viability for development. Consideration will also need to be given to how the policy will be implemented. It is noted that Essex County Council have commissioned work on the 20% BNG, but there should be a local assessment undertaken to support such a policy in the local plan. Policy EN3 is not Sound as it	Amended to minimum 10% BNG. To justify such policies for 20% they will need to be evidenced including as to local need for a higher percentage, local opportunities for a higher percentage and any impacts on viability for development. Consideration will also need to be given to how the policy will be implemented.	Yes	Not Ans wer ed		A	Objects to BNG 20% requriment and the evidence for it.	As set out in paragraph 18.29 'Local areas can set a higher requirement through their plans where it can be demonstrated it would be deliverable. Viability testing has indicated it is possible to secure 20% biodiversity net gain on greenfield sites, and this requirement has been set for those sites to improve local contribution to the local Nature Recovery network identified through the Local Nature Recovery	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											is not effective or justified and should be amended accordingly.							Strategy for Essex'.	
0329-0003	Organisation	Ben	Green	The Woodland Trust		ENV3											2. Biodiversity Net Gain (Policy ENV3) Castle Point proposes a 10 per cent Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for brownfield sites and 20 per cent for greenfield sites. This is encouraging, but to maximise ecological benefit: The Woodland Trust calls for: • A minimum of 20 per cent BNG across all sites, not just greenfield, to reflect emerging best practice and ensure consistent nature recovery. • 50 years' maintenance and monitoring of BNG sites, recognising the decades required for woodland habitats to mature. • Clear exclusion of ancient woodland and veteran trees from net gain calculations, in line with	Comments noted. Mods proposed in relation to Woodland Trust's third bullet. 18:20 As set out in the NPPF, development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons. In line with the regulations, such irreplaceable habitats are also excluded from	Y

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	the Planners' Manual's recognition that loss of irreplaceable habitats always results in net biodiversity loss. We also support the use of the Urban Greening Factor (0.3 for major commercial and 0.4 for major residential schemes) but recommend expanding this into a Tree Equity Approach, ensuring greening efforts prioritise deprived and low-canopy areas, as outlined in the Tree Strategy Template. Also call for a programme of monitoring and enforcement. Protection of Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees (Policy ENV1 & ENV3) The Plan correctly identifies ancient woodland as an irreplaceable habitat and references NPPF protections. However, stronger	biodiversity net gain calculations since it is recognised that loss of irreplaceable habitats always results in net biodiversity loss. Biodiversity net gain should be subject to maintenance and monitoring for at least 30 years.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	policy wording is essential: The Woodland Trust calls for: • Explicit adoption of the recommended NPPF policy wording (paragraph 193, subsection c): “Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons”. • Recognition that compensation cannot offset loss of ancient woodland or veteran trees. • Buffer zones: at least 50 metres for ancient woodland and 15x trunk diameter (or 5m beyond canopy) for veteran trees. • A proactive programme of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) for all ancient and veteran trees, and expansion of the Ancient Tree Inventory.		

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1448-0004	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular Architecture	Not Stated	ENV 3					Biodiversity- maximise greenery along all arterial roads and commuter routes with dense tree planting and the introduction of hedgerows and wherever possible financial incentives to get more private property owners on side.		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Greenery should be maximised along arterial and commuter routes with tree planting and hedgerows, incentivising private owners.	Noted	N
0269-0003	Organisation	Annie	Gordon	Essex Wildlife Trust	Not Stated	ENV 4	Yes	Policy ENV4: Local Wildlife and Geological Sites While we support several elements of the policy, we must formally object to Policy ENV4 as unsound due to fundamental concerns with paragraph 4. We support paragraphs 1-3 of Policy ENV4, which provide an appropriate framework for the conservation and enhancement of locally designated sites. These paragraphs demonstrate a clear commitment to active conservation and enhancement of both biodiversity and geodiversity interests, supported by the comprehensive LoWS Review (2023-2024) and formal endorsement from the Essex Local Nature Partnership. We also welcome paragraphs 5-6, which properly integrate the policy with Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) habitat priority measures and Areas of Particular Importance for Biodiversity. This strategic connectivity is essential for successful nature recovery and demonstrates forward-	No	Justified, Effective	However, we strongly object to Policy ENV4 as unsound due to paragraph 4, which permits development on Local Wildlife Sites with mitigation. This provision fails multiple tests of soundness and undermines the policy's overall effectiveness. Failure of the Justified Test Paragraph 4 contains a fundamental logical contradiction. Local Wildlife Sites are designated specifically because they are significant biodiversity assets that merit protection. If these sites could be simply replaced through mitigation measures, they would not meet the criteria for designation in the first place. The policy therefore undermines its own rationale by allowing development with mitigation on sites that have been scientifically identified as biodiversity assets of county-level importance. Inconsistency with National Policy The provision directly conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly paragraph 179, which requires planning	Recommended Modification To address these fundamental concerns, we recommend replacing paragraph 4 with the following: "Development proposals that would result in the loss of or harm to a Local Wildlife Site, Local Geological Site, or Potential Local Wildlife Site will be refused unless there are exceptional reasons to justify development in that location. Proposals must demonstrate that every reasonable effort has been taken to minimise harm through avoidance, and any residual harm must be fully mitigated." This modification would align the policy with the scientific basis for site designation, support statutory biodiversity duties, protect core components of the nature recovery network, and provide policy coherence while maintaining appropriate flexibility for truly exceptional circumstances.	Not Stated		No	A	Formally object to Policy ENV4 as unsound due to fundamental concerns with paragraph 4. But support several elements of the policy. We support paragraphs 1-3 of Policy ENV4, which provide an appropriate framework for the conservation and enhancement of locally designated sites. These paragraphs demonstrate a clear commitment to active conservation and enhancement of both biodiversity and geodiversity interests, supported by the comprehensive LoWS Review (2023-2024) and formal endorsement from the Essex Local Nature Partnership.	Comments noted. Agree to proposed mod.	Y ENV4 - Replace paragraph 4 with the following : ENV4 - Replace paragraph 4 with the following : "Development proposals that would result in the loss of or harm to a Local Wildlife Site, Local Geological Site, or Potential Local Wildlife Site will not be

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
								thinking planning that aligns with national biodiversity objectives.			policies to "safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats." Safeguarding means protection and preservation, not managing decline through mitigation. Additionally, the policy conflicts with the Government's 30 by 30 commitment, which requires protecting 30% of land by 2030, and undermines the very sites identified as core components of the nature recovery network in the Essex LNRS. Effectiveness Concerns Paragraph 4 cannot effectively deliver biodiversity conservation or nature recovery objectives. The subjective standard of "every reasonable effort" provides no measurable criteria for enforcement, while the concept of "full mitigation" is scientifically questionable for habitats of high and very high distinctiveness. The policy creates a fundamental contradiction with Policy ENV3's biodiversity net gain requirements and fails to address the cumulative impact of individual site losses on landscape-scale ecological functions. Statutory Duty Implications Paragraph 4 raises concerns regarding the Council's statutory biodiversity duty under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. By permitting						We also welcome paragraphs 5-6, which properly integrate the policy with Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) habitat priority measures and Areas of Particular Importance for Biodiversity. This strategic connectivity is essential for successful nature recovery and demonstrates forward-thinking planning that aligns with national biodiversity objectives. However, we strongly object to Policy ENV4 as unsound due to paragraph 4, which permits development on Local Wildlife Sites with mitigation. This provision fails multiple tests of soundness and undermines the policy's overall effectiveness. Failure of the Justified Test Paragraph 4 contains a			permitted be refused unless it can be clearly demonstrated that every reasonable effort has been taken to minimise the harm arising through avoidance, and any residual harm arising is fully mitigated. there are exceptional reasons to justify development in that location . Proposals must demonstrate that every reasona

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development on designated biodiversity sites, the policy represents a failure to have proper regard to biodiversity conservation and enhancement. This approach undermines the Council's ability to properly discharge its legal obligations and conflicts with best practice demonstrated by other local authorities.						fundamental logical contradiction. Local Wildlife Sites are designated specifically because they are significant biodiversity assets that merit protection. If these sites could be simply replaced through mitigation measures, they would not meet the criteria for designation in the first place. The policy therefore undermines its own rationale by allowing development with mitigation on sites that have been scientifically identified as biodiversity assets of county-level importance. ENV4 - Recommended Modification To address these fundamental concerns, we recommend replacing paragraph 4 with the following: "Development proposals that would result in the loss of or harm to a Local Wildlife Site, Local Geological		ble effort has been taken to minimise harm through avoidance, and any residual harm must be fully mitigated."

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	Site, or Potential Local Wildlife Site will be refused unless there are exceptional reasons to justify development in that location. Proposals must demonstrate that every reasonable effort has been taken to minimise harm through avoidance, and any residual harm must be fully mitigated." This modification would align the policy with the scientific basis for site designation, support statutory biodiversity duties, protect core components of the nature recovery network, and provide policy coherence while maintaining appropriate flexibility for truly exceptional circumstances.		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 0 1 2 - 0 0 0 7	Agent	Aru n	Srisk and a	Oiko s Stor age Ltd c/o Ada ms Hen dry Con sulti ng Ltd	Yes	EN V4	Yes		No	Effective, Justified	Oikos supports the position stated in the Castle Point Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) Review 2023 that confirms the additional land at Brick House Farm Marsh, which in previous versions of the Local Plan had been included within the Local Wildlife Site (LWS) area, was not of sufficient value to meet the selection criteria. As such, it has been redesignated as a Potential Local Wildlife Site (PoLWS)(Brick House Farm Marsh Extension). As the leaseholder of these sites, Oikos would be grateful to be advised of any future review of these sites. 30. Oikos welcomes the subsequent reduction in the extent of the LWS at Brick House Farm Marsh, noting the boundary has been reverted to the position outlined in 2012. Unfortunately, this position is not clearly shown on the polices map due to the quality of the image but also because of the overlap of the Green Lung designation covering the same area of land and making the boundary difficult to identify. Notwithstanding this and on the basis that what is shown on the policies map reflects the boundaries in the LWS Review document, Oikos would like to make the following further points. 31. Oikos notes that there	Oikos would politely request that criteria 1-3 within the policy are combined to remove duplication and criterion 4 is amended to provide clarity on the differing policy requirements for existing and potential Local Wildlife Sites.	Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	Oikos request that criteria 1-3 within the policy are combined to remove duplication and criterion 4 is amended to provide clarity on the differing policy requirements for existing and potential Local Wildlife Sites. Request for criterion 4 is amended to provide clarity on the differing policy requirements for existing and potential Local Wildlife Sites.	Noted. Changes are not considered necessary. Criteria 4 has been amended, please see mods list.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											would appear to be duplication within the first three criteria of the policy. All three refer to the conservation and enhancement of either existing or potential LWS and/or Local Geological Sites. Oikos consider that this duplication is unnecessary and ineffective, and the wording should be amended to provide clarity. 32. Furthermore, Oikos notes from the suggested wording of criterion 4 that there is no apparent difference in policy terms and the various requirements set out, between a site that is a LWS and a site which is a PoLWS. This is an unjustified approach, which in effect means the same level of policy protection is given to an existing LWS as to one that only has the potential to be an LWS. The policy should, however, clearly differentiate between existing and potential sites to reflect the difference in their ecological value.								
0937-0009	Individual	Jonathan	Pinnock		Yes	ENV4	Yes		Yes				Not Answered	Not Answered		A	Supports Policy ENV4	Support noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0337-0005	Organisation	Alex	Savine	Thurrock Council		ENV4	Yes	Similarly, Thurrock Council endorses the inclusion of direct reference to the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy within Policy ENV4 (Local Wildlife and Geological Sites) requiring development proposals to be designed to enable and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities, and to ensure areas that are identified as an Area of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (APIBs) are protected. Given the novel nature of the LNRS's the wording of this policy takes a proportionate approach that seeks to improve biodiversity without limiting development proposals from coming forward.	Yes								TC supports Policy ENV4 and the direct reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy requiring development proposals to have regard for and protect strategically important areas of biodiversity.	CPBC and TC agree to enable and support biodiversity opportunities through their local plans.	N
0269-0004	Organisation	Annie	Gordon	Essex Wildlife Trust	Not Stated	ENV5	Yes	4. Policy ENV5: Design Features that Encourage Biodiversity We support Policy ENV5 as a positive step toward integrating species conservation into planning policy. The policy addresses genuine conservation priorities for species facing significant population declines and provides clear, implementable requirements.	Yes		The policy meets the tests of soundness, though its ultimate effectiveness will depend on robust implementation and enforcement by the Council. The policy is positively prepared, addressing objectively assessed conservation needs for priority species based on evidence from the Castle Point Green and Blue Infrastructure Study and Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy. The species selection appropriately focuses on swifts (red-listed with severe population decline), hedgehogs (now officially vulnerable to	Recommendations for Policy Enhancement While the policy addresses the most critical species priorities, we recommend the Council considers expanding the policy to include additional design features that could further enhance biodiversity outcomes. Several other integrated building features could complement the current requirements: Sparrow Terraces for communal nesting sparrows (declined by 50% since mid-1970s, red-listed), Starling Boxes for this gregarious species (declined by 66%, also red-listed), Bee Bricks for solitary bees (250	Not Stated		No	A	Supports Policy EN5 Suggests several other species that could be specifically targetted including House Sparrows, Starlings and Soliray Bees.	Support noted. The Council has targetted just those species specifically highlighted in the NPPF a this stage (See NPPF 187d)	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											extinction), and bats (facing ongoing habitat pressures from artificial lighting and development). The policy is well-justified with clear evidence from authoritative sources and follows established best practice guidance. The requirements are proportionate and technically deliverable - swift brick requirements follow proven British Standard specifications, hedgehog gates represent practical design modifications, and bat lighting requirements reference established Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance. The policy is consistent with national policy, directly implementing NPPF paragraph 187 requirements and aligning with statutory species protection legislation. Conservation Benefits and Implementation The policy addresses critical conservation needs. Swift populations have declined by over 50% primarily due to loss of nesting opportunities in modern buildings, while hedgehogs are now officially vulnerable to extinction with habitat fragmentation being a key threat. The policy requirements will help maintain nesting opportunities and habitat connectivity respectively, while bat-sensitive lighting	of Britain's 270 bee species, though scientific opinion remains divided on effectiveness), and Bat Access Tiles as alternatives to integrated boxes. We suggest these additional features could be included as optional enhancements or considered for future policy updates, allowing the Council to gain experience with the core requirements while building toward more comprehensive biodiversity integration. Implementation Considerations The policy would benefit from clear developer guidance on feature specifications and placement to ensure consistent, high-quality implementation. Regular assessment of feature usage could inform future policy refinements and demonstrate conservation outcomes. Brighton & Hove Council's experience with mandatory bee bricks since 2020 could provide useful lessons for expanding requirements. We would emphasise that effective enforcement and monitoring will be crucial to achieving the policy's conservation objectives. Without proper implementation oversight, even well-designed policies may fail to deliver meaningful biodiversity benefits.							

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											protects important foraging routes. However, the policy's conservation value will ultimately depend on effective implementation and long-term monitoring. The Council should ensure that installed features are properly positioned, maintained, and monitored for occupancy and effectiveness. Clear guidance on optimal placement and coordination with landscape design will be essential to maximize conservation benefits.								
1 4 4 0 - 0 0 1 4	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	ENV 5	Yes		No	Justified	Policy ENV5 – We welcome the inclusion of Swift bricks in Point 1. Swift bricks or boxes can be in clusters of >3 as they are a communal species, where practical to do so. Larger industrial or commercial units should be expected to contribute more boxes overall than smaller residential developments. There also needs to be Policy around renovation work to ensure no loss of nest sites. Point 2 needs a clause added to exempt conservation fencing - such as the RSPB putting up a predator exclusion fence on our West Canvey reserve. Point 3. Low/no lighting needs to be considered on or around sites of high invertebrate/nature value.	Point 1: wording to be added to account for the disparity in contribution possible for commercial and larger developments. Suggested changes: Wording to clarify for Minor Developments, classed as up to 9 residential units or less than 1,000 square metres of commercial floorspace, the minimum number of swift bricks (or boxes) needed is: • residential developments - three bricks, or two per dwelling, whichever is the greater. • commercial developments - three bricks, or one per 50 square metres of floorspace, whichever is the greater. Major developments, classed as 10+ residential units or 1,000 square metres or more of commercial floorspace. For major developments the County	No				Policy ENV5 – We welcome the inclusion of Swift bricks in Point 1. Swift bricks or boxes can be in clusters of >3 as they are a communal species, where practical to do so. Larger industrial or commercial units should be expected to contribute more boxes overall than smaller residential developments. There also needs to be Policy around renovation work to ensure no loss of nest sites. Point 2 needs a clause added to exempt conservation fencing - such as the RSPB putting up	This policy specifically addresses the three species identified in NPPF para 187(d). Mods proposed.	Addition to Supporti ng text 18.42 and the Council' s commit ment to nature conserv ation, local policy has address ed this issue. The policy stipulat es an average of at least

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												Ecologist will recommend specific requirements. We recommend adding wording such as: "renovations and refurbishments must not result in loss of nest sites, and any losses should be replaced on a like-for-like basis." Recommend Swift boxes be in clusters of >3 where practical to do so, as they are a communal species. Point 2: add a clause such as: "with exemptions for conservation fencing where appropriate". This would help the RSPB or other conservation organisations, for example when putting up a predator exclusion fence on our West Canvey reserve. Point 3. Suggest adding the wording: "There should be consideration of low or zero lighting around sites of high invertebrate/nature value, reflecting the substantial body of evidence around the impacts of artificial lighting on invertebrates. In addition, in relation to Point 3, reference to the invertebrate interest on Canvey/in Castle Point and its importance in providing valuable ecosystem services (pollination, crop production, waste disposal, soil health, etc) could be included somewhere in this Policy. Also for the					a predator exclusion fence on our West Canvey reserve. Point 3. Low/no lighting needs to be considered on or around sites of high invertebrate/nature value.		one Swift brick/box per dwelling /unit, so where practical to do so they can be in clusters of greater than 3, since Swifts are a communal species. 18.43 The hedgehog is now officially National Hedgehog Conservation Strategy, published in October 2024. 'Conservation' fencing, such as predator exclusio

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												importance of coastal grazing marsh as a habitat for its flood storage benefits and unique ecology.							n fences installed on reserves by conservation organisations, may be exempt from the requirement, as appropriate
0965-0001	Organisation	Michael	Priault	Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group	Yes	ENV5	Yes		No	Effective	This policy and clause is very welcome and positive to implement NPPG swift brick guidance, but to make it fully sound and effective we request that you add "or equivalent" after "British Standard BS 42021:2022", for flexibility, because the British Standard may be updated, or other newer best-practice guidance be published, and small projects may not have access to the British Standard. If preferred, instead write "such as" before "British Standard..."	To make this clause fully sound and effective, we request that you add "or equivalent" after "British Standard BS 42021:2022". If preferred, instead write "such as" before "British Standard..."	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	This policy and clause is very welcome and positive to implement NPPG swift brick guidance, but to make it fully sound and effective we request that you add "or equivalent" after "British Standard BS 42021:2022", for flexibility, because the British Standard may be updated, or other newer best-practice guidance be published, and small projects may not have access to the British Standard. If preferred, instead write "such as"	Noted and agreed	1. For any grant of planning permission for new build developments greater than 5 metres in height, ~~that~~ there must be a minimum average of one swift brick or box per

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	before "British Standard..."		dwelling or unit. Where feasible, swift bricks integrate d into walls must be installed in preferen ce to external swift nest boxes, following best practice guidanc e (British Standar d BS 42021:2 022 or equivale nt)
0 3 4 1 - 0 0 1 7	Organisati on	Jan et	Nutt al	Nat ural Eng alnd		ENV 6	Yes	We support the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land.	Ye s							A	We support the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land.	Support noted	N
0 9 3 7 - 0 0	Individual	Jon ath an	Pinn ock		Yes	ENV 6	Yes		Ye s				Not An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed		A	Supports Policy ENV6	Support noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 0																			
1 0 2 7 - 0 0 0 7	Agent	c/o age nt	c/o age nt	Tayl or Wim pey	Yes	EN V6	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Justified	Paragraph 188 of the NPPF states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework. In the footer a specific comment is added that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. All of the agricultural land in the Borough is Grade 3 and no detailed assessment has been undertaken of the agricultural quality of the land in the Borough, beyond the Agricultural Land Classification Maps, to establish whether any is grade 3a. In these circumstances, and given the significant need to allocate land for housing, the application of the 'precautionary principle' to agricultural land is not justified. Policy ENV6 is not Sound, as it is not justified and not positively prepared	see above	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Paragraph 188 of the NPPF states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework. In the footer a specific comment is added that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. All of the agricultural land in the Borough is Grade 3 and no detailed assessment has been undertaken of the agricultural quality of the land in the Borough, beyond the Agricultural Land Classification Maps, to establish whether any is grade 3a. In these circumstances, and given the significant need to allocate land for housing, the	Noted. There are significant ares of Grade 4 in Castle Point.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	application of the 'precautionary principle' to agricultural land is not justified. Policy ENV6 is not Sound, as it is not justified and not positively prepared		
0 3 3 4 - 0 0 0 3	Organisati on	Gle nn	Smit h	ACT Roa dwa ys ltd		For ewo rd	No		No		For clarity A.C.T Roadways Ltd unsound submission related to the correct version of the Local Plan. A.C.T Roadways Ltd have since & after the event noticed other significant documents which were neither available to the committee on 23rd July 2025 when the Reg 19 was unanimously voted through! Nor publicly available / displayed or notified to the residents and or businesses of Castle Point. Those documents were both produced in August 25. They are:- attached.to this email with a synopsis and reasoning below. 1. The housing capacity Topic Paper of August 20252. CPBC Statement of Common Ground Castle Point Plan 2026 to 2043 Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Draft Re Land East of Manor Trading Estate, Benfleet Between Castle Point Borough Council and Essex County Council Of August 25 Further and of significanceRe The housing Capacity Topic Paper of August 2025. Meta Data indicates that this PDF was				Yes - see atta ch me nt	Non e	State that significant documents which were neither available to the committee on 23rd July 2025 when the Reg 19 was unanimously voted through! Nor publicly available / displayed or notified to the residents and or businesses of Castle Point. Those documents were both produced in August 25. They are:- attached.to this email with a synopsis and reasoning below. 1. The housing capacity Topic Paper of August 20252. CPBC Statement of Common Ground Castle Point Plan 2026 to 2043 Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Draft Re Land East of Manor Trading Estate, Benfleet Between Castle Point	Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											converted on 15th August 2025. 23 days after the committee voted on 23rd July & 14 days after the Reg 19 consultation commenced. Conclusion This was not available to either councillors or the public. Re the statement of common ground, is entitled “Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Draft” it is clearly not a document that was produced pre the Reg 19 approval! The Reg 19 consultation closed on 26th Sept 2025, this document was not only not available it was not produced until the earliest in August 2025 – albeit it has no meta data that identifies the true date of the agreement, it transpires the PDF was created 30/09/2025 but regardless of when it was first discussed or a topic on conversation it was not agreed until 29th September 3 days after the closing date of the regulation 19 consultation.						Borough Council and Essex County Council Of August 25 Further and of significanceRe The housing Capacity Topic Paper of August 2025. Meta Data indicates that this PDF was converted on 15th August 2025. 23 days after the committee voted on 23rd July & 14 days after the Reg 19 consultation commenced. Conclusion This was not available to either councillors or the public. Re the statement of common ground, is entitled “Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Draft” it is clearly not a document that was produced pre the Reg 19 approval! The Reg 19 consultation closed on 26th Sept 2025, this document was not only not available it was not produced until the earliest in August 2025 – albeit it has no meta data that identifies the true date of the agreement, it transpires the PDF was created		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	30/09/2025 but regardless of when it was first discussed or a topic on conversation it was not agreed until 29th September 3 days after the closing date of the regulation 19 consultation.		
0 3 9 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joanne	Stator		Not State d	For eword	Not stat ed		No t Sta ted		No one should have to make a Local Plan again. It is a monumental waste of time and many Castle Point Officers are only interested in Londoners and money. Not locals. Not environment. The process has been designed to lock people out from giving views.		No			Non e	Does not feel we need a local plan	Comments noted.	N
0 4 9 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Janet	Mitchell		Yes	For eword					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 4 9 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	De bor ah	Cox		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 4 9 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Dav id	Gub b		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 4 9 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	San dra	Cro whu rst		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 4 9 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jac kie	Hyd e		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 4 9 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Joy ce	Mea dow s		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 4 9 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Dor een	Fran klin		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 0 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Carol	Spicer		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 0 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ge org e	Whit tens		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 0 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jea n	Roo ney		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 0 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Linda	Phillips		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0504-0003	Individual	Thomas	Cook		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0505-0003	Individual	Iris	Leonard		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 0 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Dennis	Huckle		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 0 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Pat	Plan t		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 0 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Juli a	Silve ster		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0511-0003	Individual	John	Leonard		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 1 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ray	Clar ke		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 1 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Joan	Hill		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 1 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Car ole	Mal one		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0518-0003	Individual	Martin	Rooney		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0519-0003	Individual	Brian	Crowhurst		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 2 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Dor oth y	Pant er		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 2 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Edit h	Oliv er		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 2 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Gle nda	Spo ner		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 2 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Sandra	Gardner		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 2 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Col in	Bate s		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 2 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	De e	Isbel l		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 2 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	An ne	Coo k		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 2 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Gin a	Ridg ewel l		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 3 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Bar bar a	Lee		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.							consultation statement.	
0531-0003	Individual	Lyn	Hawkes		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 3 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Chr isto phe r	Mur phy		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 3 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Pa mel a	Mal ey		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 3 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jeanne	Rhodes		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0536-0003	Individual	Ann	Godfrey		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0537-0003	Individual	Shirley	Hymas		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0538-0003	Individual	Kathleen	Furnell		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 3 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Gar y	Haw kes		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 4 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Joy ce	Kelly		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0541-0003	Individual	June	Malpass		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 4 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jan et	Bear d		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 4 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Joy ce	Dou ghty		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 4 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jean	Preston		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 4 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jea n	Bak er		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 4 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Shi rley	Wal sh		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not		Yes			A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 4 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Susan	Phelps		Yes	For eword					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0549-0003	Individual	Jean	Cole		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0550-0003	Individual	Fra ces	Pac kham		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0551-0003	Individual	Sharon	Colayir		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 5 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jani ce	McD onn ell		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 5 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ivy	Fish er		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Car ol	Cha mbe rs		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0557-0003	Individual	Linda	Conlon		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0559-0003	Individual	Terry	Williams		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0560003	Individual	Frances	Hammond		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 6 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	She ila	Den ham		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 6 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ma ure en	Wag horn		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 6 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ric hard	May		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 6 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Bre nda	Spe ncer		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 6 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Bar bara	Ben nett		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 6 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mar ilyn	Coo k		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0571-0003	Individual	Bernard	Chambers		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0572-0003	Individual	Susan	Dillon		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 7 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Susan	Tilley		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 7 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Sha ron	Port er		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 7 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ja me s	Willi s		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 7 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Cheryl	Taylor		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0577-0003	Individual	Debbie	Mcquade		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0578-0003	Individual	Joan	Billings		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0580-0003	Individual	Valerie	Norris		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 8 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ray mo nd	Billi ngs		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 8 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Sid ney	Phel ps		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 8 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Dav id	Tugg ey		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 8 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mo nic a	Clar k		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 8 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jan et	Bak er		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 8 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Sue	Byrne		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0587-0003	Individual	Vera	Allen		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0589-0003	Individual	Marion	Warrion		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 9 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Juli e	Hutt on		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	She lley	Hull		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 9 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ale xan dra	Web ber		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 9 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Gill ian	OCor nor		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ros e	Coo k		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 9 6 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Mic hae l	Hym as		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 5 9 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ronal d	Furn ell		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Haz el	Dani els		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 5 9 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ma ure en	Vale		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 6 0 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	An n	Eldri dge		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 0 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jen ny	McQ uade		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 6 0 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jen ny	Lee		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0604-0003	Individual	Linda	Gibbs		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 0 5 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Keith	Bear d		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 6 0 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Doreen	Hun nabl e		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 6 0 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Syl via	Sain s		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 0 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Les ley	Mills		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 6 1 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Joan	Pop e		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 6 1 1 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Linda	Gibson		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 1 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Linda	Cooper		Yes	For eword					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 6 1 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Linda	Coyte		Yes	For eword					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 6 1 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Susan	Hinton		Yes	For word					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0617-0003	Individual	Rose	Malpass		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0618-0003	Individual	Jeann	Doolan		Yes	Forward					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0 6 1 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Kim	Ros e		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.						Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 2 0 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Jun e	Mox ham		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.					A	Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N
0 6 2 2 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Ter enc e	Morr is		Yes	For ewo rd					I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not						Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised.	Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them.								
0634-0002	Individual	Megan	Bonwell		Yes	For word	No		No		Given the feedback and OBJECTIONS to the soundness of the plan from the Essex County Council, Basildon Council, Rochford District Council (includes Brentwood Borough Council), Canvey Island Town Council and now Southend City Council I believe what you are trying to achieve has been rushed, not thoroughly thought through and will impact Canvey Island massively. Mismanagement from the highest order without thinking about the local residents and the risk factors involved.		No	Not Answered	Not Answered	None	The Plan has been rushed and not thought through, this is reflected in surrounding councils objection comments	Comment noted. This Plan has been worked on since 2022 and is supported by an extensive evidence base. Objection comments submitted by neighbouring councils have been addressed where necessary.	N
0687-0001	Individual	E	ARSCOTT	No	Yes	For word	No	No as usual with these things there is a lot of blurb and no substance just a ticking box exercise by the council for the government with no consideration for the people or surrounding areas of Canvey Island	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Again tick box exercise	Abandon this ridiculous notion that in excess of 3000 additional homes can be built on Canvey Island without major impact to current population, schools, doctors, transport, roads, flooding, wildlife.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Castle Point Plan is not sound or legally compliant	Comments Noted.	N
090	Individual	Nicola	Carlson		Yes	For word	Not Ans	I would also like to add that the CPBC have not made this easy for residents to	Not An				Not An	Not Ans		A	Finding the consultation	Castle Point has tried to make the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
3 - 0 0 0 4							wer ed	respond to and I know many people have not responded as they cannot easily work out or have the time to navigate the ability to respond	sw er ed				sw ere d	wer ed			difficult to respond to	consultation as accessible as possible while still meeting legal requirements.	
0 9 0 4 - 0 0 0 4	Individual	Paul	Carl sen		Yes	For ew ord	Not Ans wer ed		No t An sw er ed			I would also like to add that the CPBC have not made this easy for residents to respond to and I know many people have not responded as they cannot easily work out or have the time to navigate the ability to respond	No t An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed		A	Finding the consultation difficult to respond to	Castle Point has tried to make the consultation as accessible as possible while still meeting legal requirements.	N
0 9 8 8 - 0 0 1 0	Agent			Pers imm on Ho mes Ltd c/o Peg asus Gro up	Yes	For ew ord	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	1.1. These representations to the Castle Point Plan (“the new Plan”) consultation are made by Pegasus Group on behalf of Persimmon Homes Ltd. Persimmon Homes has various interests in Castle Point which are promoted for residential-led development: • Land West of Benfleet (GB5) • Land East of Canvey Road, Canvey Island (GB2) • Land at The Chase, Thundersley (GB12) 1.2. As these representations will highlight, national policy is very clear on the approach that should be taken to plan positively to maximise the available opportunities to meet local housing need. The new Plan that is presented by the Council simply does not provide sufficient justification or evidence for a departure from national policy.		Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	National policy is very clear on the approach that should be taken to plan positively to maximise the available opportunities to meet local housing need. The new Plan that is presented by the Council simply does not provide sufficient justification or evidence for a departure from national policy. Persimmon Homes therefore has significant concerns about the ability for the new Plan to be found sound, if it was to be submitted for Examination in its current form. The deficiencies are throughout the new Plan and its	Comments noted and response provided to specific policy comments	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											Persimmon Homes therefore has significant concerns about the ability for the new Plan to be found sound, if it was to be submitted for Examination in its current form. The deficiencies are throughout the new Plan and its supporting evidence base, from the housing requirement that has been calculated, to the spatial strategy that have been set out, to the housing supply that has been assumed (see Q45). Persimmon Homes also has concerns about the soundness of several development management policies, as also set out in these representations. 1.3. An up-to-date Local Plan is critical for effective plan making. The current development plan was adopted in 1998, and had a plan period that ended in 2001 with the intention being for an early review to take place. Indeed, the current development plan was out-of-date at the point of adoption, given the first consultation took place in 1991 and it began the Examination process in 1994. 1.4. The lack of an effective and up-to-date local plan has had clear impacts on the Borough. The Council has consistently failed to demonstrate a five year						supporting evidence base, from the housing requirement that has been calculated, to the spatial strategy that have been set out, to the housing supply that has been assumed (see Q45). Persimmon Homes also has concerns about the soundness of several development management policies, as also set out in these representations.			

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											supply of housing, with one of the worst housing supply positions in the country. The Council has also consistently failed the Housing Delivery Test since it was introduced in 2019. These are not just numbers; this failure has had, and continue to have, real impacts on real people. As quoted in the new Plan itself, the Borough has a housing register of 600 households, an affordability ration where house prices are 11 times above local wages, areas of high deprivation, and general low economic productivity. The Council’s own Equality Impact Assessment (July 2025) for the new Plan highlights the significant negative impacts associated with a spatial strategy that does not provide for local housing needs. 1.5. The Council has a history of failing to prepare and adopt local plans. Several attempts over the previous 25 years have failed at examination, or been abandoned. The closest the Council got was in 2022 where a plan was found sound by the Planning Inspectorate – but which was subsequently withdrawn at the final stage prior to adoption. The sites promoted by Persimmon Homes were all allocated in this withdrawn Local Plan.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											and were found sound by the Inspector. 1.6. Given this history of failure in the development plan process, and the clear associated impacts, it would be logical to assume that the Council would make all efforts to prepare a sound and effective Local Plan. That is surely owed to the local community. The Council instead seems insistent on following an approach that will be found unsound and lead to yet another failed local plan – leading to additional cost for the local taxpayer, and further delay at securing an effective spatial plan for the Borough.								
0 9 7 5 - 0 0 0 1	Agent	Daniel	Rapson	Privo Land Limited c/o Ceres Property	Yes	For ew ord	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	1.1 These representations on the Castle Point Local Plan 2026-2043 Regulation 19 Draft ('the Draft Local Plan' or 'DLP') are made on behalf of Privo (The Chase) Limited "Privo". 1.2 Privo is promoting Land at and to the rear of 82 The Chase, Thundersley ('the Site') for a residential development of c.95 new homes. 1.3 Although the Site is designated as Green Belt, it aligns with the definition of 'grey belt' as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It is	Please see attached	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Considers the plan to be unsound due to concerns regarding - not meeting the minimum housing requirement - flood risk assessment - deliverability of homes proposed - the SA - Duty to cooperate	Comments noted and response provided to specific policy comments	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											considered suitable, available, and deliverable for residential development and could make a meaningful contribution to addressing the Borough’s significant shortfall in both market and affordable housing. Despite this, the Site is not proposed for residential allocation in the Draft Local Plan (DLP). 1.4 The Site forms part of a wider parcel referred to as GB12 within the DLP and the evidence base. The site was previously proposed to be allocated as part of a wider site allocation in the withdrawn Local Plan (wLP) as policy HO20 ‘The Chase, Thundersley. 1.5 In its current form, the DLP is considered fundamentally unsound when assessed against the soundness tests set out in the NPPF (paragraph 36). 1.6 The DLP’s failure to even attempt to meet the minimum housing requirement, as required by the NPPF, places it in direct conflict with national policy. This is arguably its most obvious and serious flaw. 1.7 Beyond this, there are numerous additional concerns regarding the DLP’s soundness. These include its inadequate approach to flood risk assessment and doubts over the deliverability of the limited number of new homes it does propose.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											1.8 We also have concerns regarding legal compliance, particularly in relation to the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the ‘SEA Regulations’) and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 1.9 Furthermore, we question whether the Duty to Cooperate has been properly fulfilled in the preparation of the DLP. 1.10 This representation is structured as follows: Section 2 considers the DLP and the Duty to Cooperate Section 3 sets out concerns in relation to the DLP in terms of its compliance with the SEA Regulations. Section 4 considers Policy SP3 (Meeting Development Needs), and why it is considered unsound Section 5 discusses the site selection process, and in particular its approach to Green Belt sites and, specifically, the Site.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 0 0 0 - 0 0 0 1	Agent	Sam	Hollingsworth	Rainier Developments c/o Ceres Property	Yes	Forward	No		No		1.1 These representations on the Castle Point Local Plan 2026-2043 Regulation 19 Draft ('the Draft Local Plan' or 'DLP') are made on behalf of Rainier Developments & Strategic Land ('Rainier'). 1.2 Rainier is promoting Land South of Daws Heath Road, Thundersley ('the Site') for a residential development of c.58 new homes, 50% of which are to be provided as affordable homes. 1.3 The Site is Green Belt but considered to meet the definition of grey belt as per the NPPF with reference to the guidance in PPG. It is suitable, available and achievable for residential development, and able to contribute towards meeting the Borough's acute market and affordable housing shortages. The Site, however, is not proposed to be allocated for residential development in the DLP. 1.4 The DLP in its currently form is considered to be unsound when considered against the soundness tests set out in the NPPF. 1.5 Its failure to even attempt to meet minimum housing requirement as per the NPPF renders it very much contrary to national policy, and is perhaps the most immediately apparent defect, as well as its most significant. 1.6 However, there are a		Yes	Not Answered	Yes - See attachments	B - updated attachments	Considers the plan to be unsound due to concerns regarding - not meeting the minimum housing requirement - flood risk assessment - deliverability of homes proposed - the SA - Duty to cooperate	Comments noted and response provided to specific policy comments	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											number of other soundness concerns evident in respect of the DLP, including in relation to its approach to considering flood risk issues as well as the deliverability of the limited number of new homes the DLP does suggest it will deliver. 1.7 Additionally, we have concerns with legal compliance, specifically vis-à-vis the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (“the SEA Regulations”) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which accompanies the DLP. 1.8 We also have concerns as to whether the Duty to Cooperate has been complied with in the preparation of the DLP. 1.9 This representation is structured as follows: Section 2 considers the DLP and the Duty to Cooperate Section 3 sets out concerns in relation to the DLP in terms of its compliance with the SEA Regulations. Section 4 considers Policy SP3 (Meeting Development Needs), and why it is considered unsound Section 5 addresses Policy DH2 (Coalescence of Settlements – Daws Heath), and why it is considered unsound Section 6 discusses the site selection process, and in particular its approach to Green Belt sites and.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											specifically, the Site. Section 7 sets out a summary and conclusion.								
0 7 3 8 - 0 0 0 1	Organisati on	Roy	War ren	Spor t Engl and	Yes	For ew ord	Yes		Ye s		Support is offered for the proposed vision in terms of green spaces, community buildings and other community spaces delivering health and wellbeing outcomes. This vision would accord with Government policy in paragraph 96(c) of the NPPF and Sport England's 'Uniting the Movement' Strategy https://www.sportengland.org/about-us/uniting-movement		No t An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Support is offered for the proposed vision in terms of green spaces, community buildings and other community spaces delivering health and wellbeing outcomes	Support noted.	N
0 7 3 8 - 0 0 0 2	Organisati on	Roy	War ren	Spor t Engl and	Yes	For ew ord	Yes		Ye s		Objectives 2, 3, 17 and 19 are supported as these objectives would support the provision of opportunities for sport/physical activity and encourage active environments. These objectives would be consistent with Sport England's Planning for Sport objectives https://www.sportengland.org		No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Objectives 2, 3, 17 and 19 are supported as these objectives would support the provision of opportunities for sport/physical activity and encourage active environments.	Support noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											rg/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/planning-sport?section=planning_for_sport_guidance and Government policy in paragraph 96(c) of the NPPF.								
1 0 2 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ma rtin	Engl and		Yes	For ew ord	No	The draft plan is not legally compliant as it fails to consider strategic alternatives, like North West Thundersley, which has been excluded, the Biodiversity and environmental protection needs strengthening, there is no credible five-year housing land supply and a lack of evidence on cross-boundary infrastructure with a duty to cooperate. The policy of not building on the Greenbelt is biased and predetermined.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	As a campaign, the Save Hadleigh Farmland Group have their own views and opinions, which have been constantly abused by councillors on social media, to discredit me and the campaign, which continued during the consultation process, even into the last week. The SHF campaign group held a social event, at 2.15pm on Saturday 20th September, to discuss various points including the local plan consultation, and residents were intimidated by three PIP councillors that turned up outside, in an attempt to discredit our opinions, who were handing out their own leaflets was a blatant attempt to undermine public participation in the consultation, to deter residents from providing their views and engaging in the consultation process, thus weakening the plan's justification and effectiveness, see attached photos. This means they only want responses from the community that they approve of and their own leaflet was a fabricated biased view of political		Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	Unhappy with councillors conduct with regards to public consultation	Noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											ideology, with predetermination set in most paragraphs, if you accept one piece of Greenbelt, you accept them all, and political parties and councillors are fully entitled to have views, which is predisposition, but when that agenda and those views affect your decisions making process it is predetermination, see the leaflet attached. This should be investigated by the inspector.								
0 9 5 8 - 0 0 0 5	Individual	Philip	Howe	The People's Independent Party	Yes	For ew ord	Yes		Yes		I believe the Council has been positively prepared due to the high level of community engagement throughout the plan's preparation. The final draft clearly reflects the overwhelming community preference for a brownfield-first strategy and targeted investment in town centres, which validates the Council's approach.		Not An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed	Yes		Support for the plan and that it represents the outcomes of the consultations and reflects what the local community has asked for.	Support noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1002-0001	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	Forward	No	The Regulation 19 consultation has not been undertaken properly, with two materially different versions of the Local Plan on the Council's website, and important documents added to the document library midway through the consultation period.	No	Positively prepared	Please refer to Appendix A for full details. Castle Point is not entitled to have taken the strategic approach that it has to the delivery of homes. The result is a Plan that advocates the delivery of around half of the homes that are actually needed (with reference to the Standard Method). The Council's justification for having taken this approach is not convincing and does not withstand scrutiny (for example, the suggestion that all Green Belt sites are unsustainable, when the Council's evidence base shows that GB8 is sustainably located). The Council will need to release Green Belt land for development to provide enough homes. The starting point in that process should be to release land that qualifies as 'Grey belt'. South of Hadleigh (GB8) is Grey Belt for the reasons described in these representations. The Council's Sustainability Appraisal Annexes (July 2025) confirms that the site has good public transport links and accessibility (pg. 579), has good access to local services (pg. 630 and is well served by health services (pg. 745). Contrary to the evidence presented by the Council, there would be no heritage	Please refer to Appendix A for full details. Consult on all documents, and one version of draft Local Plan. Include allocations (including GB) to meet Standard Method Need.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	B - updated attachments	The Regulation 19 Plan is not sound. Its approach to the delivery of homes falls significantly short of the Framework's requirements and the strategic approach to the allocation of land towards meeting needs is not appropriate. The Castle Point Plan needs to release Green Belt land to help it meet identified housing need and the Plan has not been positively prepared. Promotes the Hadleigh Estate (site reference GB8) as available, suitable and achievable for development of a mix of uses, including approximately 900 new homes. The Council's assessment of this site is flawed and inaccurate and on proper analysis, the Plan's policies should allocate this site for a mix of uses, including residential. This would assist the Council in delivering	Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Procedural concern to be investigated.	Y - <u>Policy Had2 – Hadleigh Country Park, Hadleigh Farm and Benfleet and Southend Marshes</u> Minor mod (typographic error) 2. Proposal s related to the development and/or use of the farm for agricultural and/or training purposes in line with the charitable mission of the landowner, where they do not have

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											or landscape harms arising from the allocation of the site for development that could not be mitigated through detailed design. This mitigation is reflected in the Masterplan for the site, which shows how around 900 homes could come forward, alongside a new Employment Training Centre and Rare Breeds Farm. These proposals would help to deliver the Mission of the Salvation Army, through the delivery of high-quality new extension to Hadleigh that is respectful of its neighbours and contributes towards the local community. As currently prepared, the Castle Point Plan is not sound and it should be revisited, so as to include the allocation of land at Hadleigh.						a Plan that better reflects its need. Policy SP3 (Meeting Development Need). – Does not meet the standard method figure The release of this land GB8 for development would clearly represent a significant opportunity to further the work of the church and charity in these important areas in Castle Point, and beyond, through providing enhanced community facilities as part of the masterplan, and through the generation of capital receipts. Further benefits would include substantial new and high-quality open space to be enjoyed by the existing communities around Hadleigh Farm and beyond, and substantial land made available to provide biodiversity net-gains on a significant scale. A Vision Document and illustrative masterplan provided.		a significant impact on the landscape or the Green Belt, and comply with the requirements of policy ENV4 and other relevant policies of this Plan; or <u>Paragraph 10.20</u> Also paragraph 10.20 of the supporting text says that ‘it is therefore critical that any development allowed does not have an impact on the landscape’. Any scheme

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	the Council cannot currently demonstrate a Five Year Housing Land Supply. Questions evidence – Housing Topic Paper, SLAA and Heritage Impact Assessment. 5. Policy Had2 (Hadleigh Country Park, Hadleigh Farm and Benfleet & Southend Marshes. 5.1 For the reasons described, we do not consider the draft Plan sound and do not support Policy Had2. We recognise that it broadly supports the provision of recreational, agricultural and training uses but it does not provide for much needed new homes at the site. 5.2 In addition, there is a typographic error or Part 2 of the Policy ('where they do not have a significant impact on the landscape [or] the Green belt], which we request is corrected. 5.3 Further, paragraph 10.20 of the supporting text says that 'it is		will have some level of impact on any landscape. This drafting should be revised to read 'any development allowed should not have a significant impact on the landscape'. That would reflect the language used in the main body of the Policy. <u>Policies Map errors</u> Hadleigh Estate • The location

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	therefore critical that any development allowed does not have an impact on the landscape’. Any scheme will have some level of impact on any landscape. This drafting should be revised to read ‘any development allowed should not have a significant impact on the landscape’. That would reflect the language used in the main body of the Policy. 5.4 With regard the Draft Policies Map, we have the following additional observations: • The location of the listed, and locally listed buildings are not accurate. • The key is not accurate for the Hadleigh Country Park, Hadleigh Farm, and Benfleet Southend Marches. • Diagonal on the key but hatched on the plan. • Scheduled ancient monument key does not match the colour on the plan. Beige on key, and red on plan.		of the listed, and locally listed buildings are not accurate. • The key is not accurate for the Hadleigh Country Park, Hadleigh Farm, and Benfleet Southend Marches. • Diagonal on the key but hatched on the plan. • Scheduled ancient monument key does not match the colour on the plan. Beige on

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	Procedural concerns due to two versions of the draft plan being available on the website. Document entitled Regulation 19 Draft includes at Policy SP3 the plan will deliver 6,196 new homes over 17 years. The consultation response portal entitled 'Issues & Options Consultation Document – July-September 2024 states that 5,100 new homes will be delivered over 20 years with a total of 3,595 homes within existing urban areas. This plan also says that grey belt sites in Canvey, Benfleet and Thundersley will be allocated for housing, although the capacity of those sites is left blank. Concerned that this will confuse respondents to the consultation especially in relation to the quantum of developed and whether green/grey		key, and red on plan.

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	belt sites are proposed to be released. The Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025) was introduced on the 15th August and noone was made aware of this addition despite it containing very pertinent information and concerned that not everyone is aware of it.		
00100002	Individual	Neal	Garner		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0 0 1 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ja me s	Rob bins		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0 0 1 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Eile en	Rea d		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0013-0002	Individual	Kelly	McKenzie		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0014-0	Individual	Frances	Scarff		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
002								engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.									housing distribution.	supporting Statements of Common Ground.	
0015-0002	Individual	Sam	McKenzie		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Com p lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 1 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ch eryl	Red win		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No				Not Sta ted		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0 0 1 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Chr isto phe r	Knig ht		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a	No				Not Sta ted		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0 0 1 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Michae l	Solk hon		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No				Not Sta ted		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0 0 1 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Andre w	Gos nold		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle	No				Not Sta ted		No		Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Com p lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0021-0002	Individual	Samantha	Watts		Not Stated	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No				Not Stated		No		Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0022-0002	Individual	Carly	Wright		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point’s case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0023-0002	Individual	Gina	Keble		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the ‘Duty to Cooperate’. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point’s case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	• Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0024-	Individual	Kerri	Thiptorpe		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the ‘Duty to Cooperate’. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		• Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0002								sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point’s case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.									infrastructure and housing distribution.	Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	
0025-0002	Individual	Anita	Houser		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the ‘Duty to Cooperate’. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point’s case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	• Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 2 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ree ce	Mar shall		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0 0 2 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Re bec ca	Harr is		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No		Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0 0 3 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Linda	Sadler		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0 0 4 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Carlyn	Blake		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0 0 4 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Dav id	Blak e		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0 0 4 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Kier a	Blak e		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the	No				Not Sta ted		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0047-0002	Individual	James	Robbins		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No				c		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0056-	Individual	Linda	Norton		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring	No				Not Stated		No		Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0002								sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point’s case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.									infrastructure and housing distribution.	Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	
0060-0002	Individual	Neil	Scarff		Yes	For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the ‘Duty to Cooperate’. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point’s case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Stated		No	A	• Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 6 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Col in	Duff		Not State d	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0 0 6 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mat the w	Wat son		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0 0 6 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ros aly n	Wat son		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No	A	• Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0 0 8 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Lor rain e	Cut hber tson		Not State d	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle	No	Justified, Consistent with National policy			Not Sta ted		Yes, EC C Floor Risk Con sult atio n	B - see 008 2- 000 3 to 000 5	• Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0 0 9 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ja me s	Rob bins		Yes	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No	A	• Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0 2 1 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Lyn sey	Cutt s		Not State d	For wor d	No	While I recognise the effort that has gone into preparing the Regulation 19 draft, there are several areas where, in my view, the Plan does not yet meet the legal tests of soundness and compliance, and these must be addressed before submission for examination.	No	Not Stated			Not Sta ted		No	A	• Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								A key statutory requirement is the ‘Duty to Cooperate’. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point’s case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0230-0001	Individual	Kevin	Foley		Not Stated	For word	Not Stated	As a retired IT project manager, I consider myself reasonably computer literate. However, I was genuinely astonished by how unnecessarily complex the consultation response form is. To submit a comment, one must first locate and provide all of the following: * Policy reference or name * Page number * Paragraph number * Site number or name * Objective number or name * Appendix reference or name * Table or diagram reference number * Image or map reference number This requires navigating the	Not Stated	Not Stated			Not Stated		No		States the consultation response form is unnecessarily complex and that it creates unnecessary barriers to participation.	Comments noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								interactive map and cross-referencing multiple documents just to begin commenting. Frankly, it's an over-engineered process that creates unnecessary barriers to participation. Sorry, but that's simply absurd, so I gave up completing the form.											
0 2 6 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Da wn	Ben nett		Not State d	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.	No				Not Sta ted	Not Stat ed	No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N
0 2 6 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joh n	Ben nett		Not State d	For wor d	No	A key statutory requirement is the 'Duty to Cooperate'. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the	No				Not Sta ted	Not Stat ed	No	A	Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this cooperation. In Castle Point’s case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.											
0330002	Organisation	Michael	Murrel	Basildon Council		For word	Not Stated	1.11 Basildon Borough Council believes that it has a proactive working relationship with Castle Point Council demonstrated by the ongoing regular programme of Duty to Cooperate meetings, where any emerging cross boundary issues are fully discussed and addressed by both councils.	Not Stated							B - confirm for mal response	There are no DtC issues	Noted	N
0284001	Organisation	Emma	Goodings	Brentwood Borough Council	Not Stated	For word	Yes	BBC has no specific concerns to raise over CPBC’s legal compliance with respect to the Duty to Co-operate. BBC is satisfied with the significant amount of cross-boundary engagement that CPBC has undertaken, including as part of the Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA) and Essex Planning Officers Association (EPOA). The Council would, however, like to emphasise the importance of ongoing and	Not Stated				Not Stated		No	A	No concerns to raise over CPBC’s legal compliance with respect to the Duty to Co-operate. States that continued collaboration is important Brentwood is unable to assist with CPBC’s unmet housing need Requests a	CPBC will still collaborate with BBC through SEC and EPOA to address cross boundary strategic issues. Noted that BBC is unable to assist CPBC in meeting its unmet housing need.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								meaningful collaboration between the local authorities in helping to address aspects across all identified strategic priorities, particularly in the context of infrastructure. As such, CPBC are encouraged to continue to positively and constructively engage with BBC on strategic cross-boundary issues, particularly as the Brentwood Local Plan Review progresses. Considering Paragraph 28 of the NPPF, BBC requests the agreement of a Statement of Common Ground with CPBC to evidence areas of agreement in support of the submission of the Plan for examination. BBC also wishes to make clear that it is not in a position to accommodate any unmet housing need arising from Castle Point, and no agreement currently exists to do so.									Statement of Common Ground to evidence areas of agreement.	CPBC will prepare a statement of common ground.	
0274-0001	Organisati on	Kit	Welch	Chelmsford City Council	Not State d	For word	Yes	It is noted by Chelmsford City Council that CPBC has engaged with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate to seek assistance meeting their housing need and were unable to do so. This includes approaching CCC in 2022 in CPBC’s response to the Chelmsford Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation Document. CCC recognises there may be some challenges and constraints on developable	Yes				Not Sta ted		No	A	It is noted by Chelmsford City Council that CPBC has engaged with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate to seek assistance meeting their housing need and were unable to do so. This includes approaching CCC in 2022 in CPBC’s response to the Chelmsford Local	Points noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								land in CPBC's administrative area, however CCC reiterate that they are unable to help meet any of CPBC's unmet housing need. CCC confirms that it wishes to continue to actively engage with CPBC on each other's respective Local Plans and relevant strategic cross-boundary matters including housing, employment, transport infrastructure, education, Gypsy, and Travelling provision, and Essex Coast RAMS.									Plan Issues and Options Consultation Document. CCC recognises there may be some challenges and constraints on developable land in CPBC's administrative area, however CCC reiterate that they are unable to help meet any of CPBC's unmet housing need. CCC commends the Plan's place-led approach and its clear commitment to environmental stewardship, climate resilience, and nature recovery.		
0 2 8 2 - 0 0 8 0	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	For wor d	Not Sta ted		No t Sta ted		ECC would also like to take the opportunity to re-iterate the agreed joint position with Castle Point Borough Council (CPBC) with regards to the North West Thundersley Development Option which is set out in the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG). Paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the SOCG, with regards the non-allocation of the site in this Plan and the longer term strategic planning approach. "Both CPBC and ECC agree that any potential growth in North West Thundersley must be		Not Sta ted		Yes, EC C sup plie d 8 addi ton al app endi ces con taini ng vari ous piec es	B	ECC refers to potential development in NW Thundersley. ECC acknowledge that CP's housing need is not dependent on NW Thundersley being developed, and note it would require a co-ordinated process to bring the site forward which would include input from neighbouring councils	CPBC has not allocated any sites in NW Thundersley but notes should any site be brought forward in the future, it would include input from neighbouring councils	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											master planned in a comprehensive manner over the long-term requiring collaborative work, via the Duty to Co-operate, between CPBC, ECC, Basildon Borough Council, Rochford District Council and other South Essex Councils (SEC), given their proximity and shared infrastructure corridors, including the A127/A130 strategic network and Fairglen Interchange. There are multiple land ownerships in NWT, which would require coordinated planning and infrastructure delivery. While it is recognised that large-scale developments — including new settlements — often involve complex land assembly or government support both CPBC and ECC agree that such mechanisms are not in place or sufficiently advanced to support delivery within the current plan period. The Castle Point Plan (Regulation 19) does not rely on NWT to meet its local need for housing as set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment (2023) or wider spatial objectives. As such, no allocation is proposed, and any future consideration of the site should be pursued through a longer-term strategic planning process.” Finally,				of evid enc e				

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											in the context of a Spatial Development Strategy (SDS), we note, the Greater Essex Mayoral role will involve setting a strategic framework for investment and development, including housing and employment growth. The SDS will provide clarity on the quantity and strategic locations for growth in the longer term looking forward 30 years to support and guide future Unitary Authority Local Plans, which could include areas where there are current constraints to overcome, including North West Thundersley.								
0343-0001	Agent	Ben	Weedall	Gladman Developments ltd		For word		3.1.1 The Duty to Cooperate requires engagement with prescribed bodies on relevant strategic and cross boundary matters. Paragraphs 24-27 of the NPPF sets out the requirements for Duty to Cooperate to ensure a positively prepared and justified strategy. The NPPF requires local authorities to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities on cross-boundary strategic issues throughout the process of Plan preparation. As demonstrated through the outcome of the 2020 Sevenoaks District Council Local Plan examination and								B	<u>Duty to Cooperate</u> Suggest that the Council has not complied with DtC through the preparation of Statement(s) of Common Ground (SoCG)	<u>Duty to Cooperate</u> Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								subsequent Judicial Review, if a Council fails to satisfactorily discharge its Duty to Cooperate, this cannot be rectified through modifications and an Inspector must recommend non-adoption of the Plan. Similar issues were also identified in the preparation of Castle Point’s new Local Plan(s) as identified above. 3.1.2 Local planning authorities are expected to cooperate through the preparation of Statement(s) of Common Ground (SoCG) which are required to demonstrate that a plan is based on effective cooperation and has been based on agreements made by neighbouring authorities where cross boundary strategic issues are likely to exist. Planning guidance sets out that local planning authorities should produce, maintain, and update one or more SoCG, throughout the plan making process. The SoCG(s) should provide a written record of the progress made by the strategic planning authorities during the process of planning for strategic cross-boundary matters and will need to demonstrate the measures local authorities have taken to ensure cross boundary matters have been considered and what actions are required to ensure issues											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								are proactively dealt with e.g. unmet housing needs. 3.1.3 There has been no evidence presented as part of this consultation which demonstrates how the Council have met the above duty to cooperate. Whilst the Housing Capacity Topic Paper notes that there have been discussions with neighbouring authorities this is as far as the evidence goes and it is not available for comment alongside this consultation. Without this evidence there is a real risk that the mistakes of the previous 2011-2031 Local Pan will be repeated which had to be withdrawn from examination due The Castle Point Plan 2026- 2043 Regulation 19 Draft July - September 2025 8 to a failure to discharge the duty to cooperate. If this evidence is available, it should be presented alongside the submission of this plan, if it is to progress that far.											

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0328-0001	Organisation	Sue	Howe	HSE		For word	Not Stated	HSE is not a statutory consultee for local and neighbourhood plans. If there is a nuclear installation within or nearby your local plan area we recommend you contact the Office of Nuclear Regulation. HSE has provided Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) with access to its LUP Web App https://pa.hsl.gov.uk/ and downloadable GIS consultation zones. These tools alongside HSE’s published methodology (https://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.htm) can assist you in ensuring that land allocations do not conflict with major hazard sites and pipelines, licenced explosives sites and nuclear installations. Your attention is drawn to the planning policy guidance provided by your central planning departments in England, Scotland and Wales. For England: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/hazardous-substances-in-particular paragraphs 65 to 69 which explain an LPAs responsibilities when taking public safety into account in planning decisions and formulating local plans. For Scotland: https://www.gov.scot/publications/circular-3-2015-planning-controlshazardous-substances/pages/2/ Annex	Not Stated	Not Stated					A	HSE is not a statutory consultee for local and neighbourhood plans. If there is a nuclear installation within or nearby your local plan area we recommend you contact the Office of Nuclear Regulation. HSE has provided Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) with access to its LUP Web App https://pa.hsl.gov.uk/ and downloadable GIS consultation zones. These tools alongside HSE’s published methodology (https://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.htm) can assist you in ensuring that land allocations do not conflict with major hazard sites and pipelines, licenced explosives sites and nuclear installations. Your attention is drawn to the planning policy guidance provided by your central planning departments in	Noted	N	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								F For Wales: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/wsi/2015/1597/contents/made									England, Scotland and Wales. For England: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/hazardous-substances-in-particular-paragraphs 65 to 69 which explain an LPAs responsibilities when taking public safety into account in planning decisions and formulating local plans. For Scotland: https://www.gov.scot/publications/circular-3-2015-planning-controlshazardous-substances/pages/2 / Annex F For Wales: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/wsi/2015/1597/contents/made		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2 5 8 - 0 0 0 2	Agent	Lor na	O'C arrol l	Iceni OBO Rich boro ugh Com mer cial	Yes	For wor d	No	Iceni also have significant concerns that Castle Point's Draft Local Plan fails to demonstrate effective strategic planning across local planning authority boundaries, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024 ("NPPF"). There is also a lack of evidence to demonstrate how the Council have met their statutory duty-to-cooperate. Notwithstanding the above, it is also important to consider the importance of cross-boundary planning. Paragraphs 24 and 25 of the NPPF are clear that effective strategic planning plays a vital role in facilitating economic resilience, while joint working is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. Paragraph 27 sets out that strategic policy-making authorities should ensure that their policies align as fully as possible including ensuring that any 5 allocation which cuts across the boundary of plan areas or has significant implications for neighbouring areas is appropriately managed by all relevant authorities. Paragraph 36 notes that plans are sound if they are based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters. 24. Even if Castle Point had a surplus of	No	Consistent with National Policy		Make Duty to Cooperate Reports publicly available for review to demonstrate effective cooperation and discharge of the statutory duty.	Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes	A	Cross-Boundary Working There is no evidence provided that the Council have based their plan on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters. It is not clear that the draft Local Plan or 6 its underpinning evidence base has factored in allocations located on the Borough boundaries including land west of Canvey Way. Plan fails to supportthe Basildon economy.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								employment land (which we disagree with), Basildon Council’s Employment Land Needs Assessment1 (prepared by Lichfields, February 2025) identifies that Basildon should plan for circa 8ha of office uses and a minimum of 61ha of land for industrial and distribution uses for the plan period (2023-2043). 25. Basildon and Castle Point sit at the heart of South Essex’s economic geography, and the two economies have a strong interrelationship. Given its proximity and accessibility, Castle Point plays a key role in supporting the supply chain for Basildon’s manufacturing and logistics sectors, with SMEs providing goods and services such as materials and components supplies. 26. The current approach taken by Castle Point fails to support the key role that the Borough has in respect of the wider regional economy and similarly fails to support growth aspirations in neighbouring authorities (i.e. Basildon). It is clear that a more strategic approach needs to be taken by Castle Point in the draft Local Plan, i.e. one that acknowledges its importance for South Essex’s economic geography. 27. As a final point, it is noted within the draft Local Plan that the Council refer to having											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								undertaken engagement with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate, to explore whether there is potential to help Castle Point meet its housing need (Para 6.57), however this is not raised in respect of employment or commercial need. The draft Local Plan then goes on to refer to the ‘Duty to Cooperate Report’, however this is not available within the evidence documents. It is essential that this report is made available, so that it can be understood how the Council have approached their responsibilities regarding strategic cross-boundary planning. Without any other detailed evidence, the only conclusion that can be reached at present is that the council have failed in their Duty to Cooperate. Closing – Need and Cross Boundary 28. On the basis of above, Castle Point should therefore review their employment evidence base and changes should be reflected in the strategic needs for the Borough. A new policy should be implemented, or Policy E2 updated, to permit new employment floorspace in locations other than near town centres. While we challenge the evidence submitted by Castle Point, the NPPF is also clear that planning policies should be											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan (paragraph 86e), which the current policies also fail to do so. 29. Any review should be undertaken in consultation with Basildon, and other Local Authorities in the FEMA. 30. To summarise, the Council fails the tests of soundness as follows: a. Positively prepared – The Council’s strategic employment strategy fails to meet the economic development needs of the area and similarly does not consider the implications for the wider South Essex functional economic markets. b. Justified – The Council’s evidence base that has informed the development strategy for employment is flawed for the reasons set out within these representations, and therefore the proposed strategy has not taken into account the reasonable alternative. c. Effective – There is no evidence provided that the Council have based their plan on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters. It is not clear that the draft Local Plan or its underpinning evidence base has factored in allocations located on the Borough boundaries including land west of Canvey Wav. d.											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Consistent with national policy – The evidence base being flawed and not PPG compliant demonstrates its inconsistency with national policy. Other comments 31. The current wording of Policy T2 (Criterion 7) is not consistent with national policy, and therefore there are soundness issues with the policy as written. The Policy states “7. The Council will resist development that would impact on the effective operation, safety or resilience of the A13, A127 or A130, or associated junctions.” 32. National policy however sets a higher barrier in respect of transport impact, which the Council’s draft policy does not reflect. Paragraph 166 of the NPPF is clear that ‘Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.’ 33. A more suitably worded policy would be “The Council will resist development that would result in an unacceptable impact on the safety of A13, A127 or A130, or associated junctions. Following mitigation, the											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								Council will resist development where the residual cumulative impacts on the effective operation and resilience of the roads named above would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.” In conclusion, further work should be undertaken by Castle Point prior to the submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State to review the evidence base, with a focus on the employment evidence in particular, and changes should therefore be reflected in the strategic needs for the Borough. A new policy, or alternatively an updated Policy E2 should be incorporated. 35. Castle Point plays an important role in regional economy, but the current approach to employment needs set out by the Plan fails to support economic growth aspirations in neighbouring authorities (i.e. Basildon). A more strategic approach needs to be taken by Castle Point. 36. These amendments are considered necessary to ensure that the draft Local Plan is sound and compliant with national policy.											

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0338-0001	Organisation	Catherine	Bicknell	NHS Mid and South Essex		For word	Yes	The ICB has been consulted at each stage of Plan preparation and between the formal stages the Council has engaged the ICB in ‘duty to cooperate’ meetings. The Council has explained its process, approach and Plan content, and has listened and responded to matters raised by the ICB. Adjustments have been made to policy and supporting text in response to the ICB’s comments at earlier stages of the Plan preparation process. The ICB is satisfied that, in relation to its duties to the ICB as a statutory consultee in the plan making process, the Council has complied with the relevant regulations.	Yes		The test of “soundness” has 4 strands, the last being that the Plan must be consistent with national policy, enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF. The ICB’s comments on the “soundness” test are directed at this requirement, specifically in relation to health and wellbeing. Many of the policies in the Plan will have direct or indirect impacts on the health and wellbeing of the current and future population of Castle Point as well as the delivery of healthcare services. These are important elements of sustainability. The ICB’s response to consultation on the Castle Point Plan Issues and Options document in September 2024 set out the ICB’s priorities and outlined the Mid and South Essex Joint Forward Plan 2024-2029 before answering the specific consultation questions. Within these answers the ICB made a series of requests for amendments and comments on the Plan. The Council published its Issues and Options Consultation Statement 2025 which summarises the ICB’s comments, explains that the ICB’s comments have been considered and how matters have been					A	The ICB has been consulted at each stage of Plan preparation and between the formal stages the Council has engaged the ICB in ‘duty to cooperate’ meetings. The Council has explained its process, approach and Plan content, and has listened and responded to matters raised by the ICB. Adjustments have been made to policy and supporting text in response to the ICB’s comments at earlier stages of the Plan preparation process. The ICB is satisfied that, in relation to its duties to the ICB as a statutory consultee in the plan making process, the Council has complied with the relevant regulations.	Support noted	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											addressed. 1The ICB requested that the Plan, in addition to new development creating healthy environments and associated infrastructure, is drafted to help improve health in existing areas and reduce health inequalities that exist in the district. The Council's Issues and Options Consultation Statement 2025 explains that:								
0283-002	Organisation	Emma	Goodings	Rochford District Council	Not Stated	For word	Yes	Rochford District Council (RDC) has no specific concerns to raise over Castle Point Borough Council's (CPBC) legal compliance with respect to the Duty to Co-operate. RDC notes that while officer-level engagement has taken place through South Essex Councils (SEC) and Essex Planning Officers Association (EPOA), there has been limited member-level involvement regarding Castle Point's Local Plan. RDC encourages greater member engagement through SEC to support strategic alignment and transparency. The Council would, however, like to emphasise the importance of ongoing and meaningful collaboration between local authorities in addressing all identified strategic priorities, particularly in relation to infrastructure. CPBC is therefore encouraged to	Yes			In line with Paragraph 28 of the NPPF, RDC requests the agreement of a Statement of Common Ground with CPBC to evidence areas of agreement in support of the submission of the Plan for examination. RDC also wishes to make clear that it is not in a position to accommodate any unmet housing need arising from Castle Point, and no agreement currently exists to do so.	Not Stated		No	A	States that there are no Duty to Cooperate concerns with CP. Good working relationship at officer level but queries member DtC with reference to the local plan. Requests a Statement of Common Ground to be put in place.	All South Essex members including CPBC members meet their Duty to Cooperate through SEC and EPOA and will continue to collaborate on strategic matters through these bodies. CPBC to draw up a Statement of Common Ground	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								continue to positively and constructively engage with RDC on strategic cross-boundary matters, especially as the emerging Rochford Local Plan progresses.											
0354-0005	Organisation	Mark	Sheppard	Southend City Council		For word	Not Stated	In relation to the strategic position of Castle Point within South Essex, we support highlighting the important inter-connections between Southend-on-Sea and Castle Point in terms of transport, employment, education and skills, and environmental assets. Leigh Port could be added to the diagram to recognise its economic and tourism role for the South Essex economy. The vision and objectives as proposed are also supported. Southend-on-Sea City Council will continue to work together with Castle Point Borough Council to further the objectives related to these cross-boundary issues.	Not Stated							A	The vision and objectives as proposed are supported. Support highlighting the important inter-connections between Southend-on-Sea and Castle Point in terms of transport, employment, education and skills, and environmental assets. . Request Key diagram is to be updated to include Leigh Port as “Port Facilities”.	Mod proposed: The Strategic Position of Castle Point within South Essex – diagram is to be updated to include Leigh Port as “Port Facilities”.	Y
1104-0002	Individual	Darren	Thipthorpe			For word	No	A key statutory requirement is the ‘Duty to Cooperate’. This is not a procedural formality but a legal obligation requiring sustained and meaningful engagement with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on strategic matters. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is explicit in its expectation that Statements of Common Ground should be used to evidence this	No								Lack of Duty to Cooperate	Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. The Council has worked collaboratively with all to ensure that the Duty to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								cooperation. In Castle Point's case, the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern. Without demonstrable cooperation, the Plan risks being found unsound on procedural grounds alone.										Cooperate has been met.	
1 4 4 1 - 0 0 0 1	Agent	Ru per t	Woo d	Tha mes Ente rpris e Park Ltd	Yes	For wor d	Yes		No	Consistent with National Policy	The Vision should be amended to ensure consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly its emphasis on effective cooperation between local authorities.	As set out previously in our response to the Issues & Options Regulation 18 Consultation, we welcome the emphasis on creating a well balanced community, combining housing, improved transport network and employment opportunities. However, the vision should be amended to ensure consistency with the NPPF, particularly its emphasis on effective cooperation between local authorities. This can be achieved by incorporating a clear commitment to improving connectivity with employment sites across the wider regional economic area, including Thurrock. Strengthening transport links between Castle Point and nearby employment centres will make it easier for residents to access jobs locally. Addressing these strategic cross-boundary issues is essential to meet NPPF requirements for sustainable development. The Vision should highlight the importance of building	No				As set out previously in our response to the Issues & Options Regulation 18 Consultation, we welcome the emphasis on creating a well balanced community, combining housing, improved transport network and employment opportunities. The Vision should be amended to ensure consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly its emphasis on effective cooperation between local authorities. This can be achieved by incorporating a clear commitment to improving connectivity with employment sites	Cooperation with neighbouring authorities is addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. Castle Point's wider economic context is addressed in Ch 14.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												strong partnerships with neighbouring authorities, such as Thurrock, to tackle shared challenges around transport, housing, and infrastructure. In addition, Castle Point should seek to maximise opportunities relating to the estuary as an economic growth opportunity, recognising its potential for trade and associated employment benefits.					across the wider regional economic area, including Thurrock. Strengthening transport links between Castle Point and nearby employment centres will make it easier for residents to access jobs locally. Addressing these strategic cross-boundary issues is essential to meet NPPF requirements for sustainable development. The Vision should highlight the importance of building strong partnerships with neighbouring authorities, such as Thurrock, to tackle shared challenges around transport, housing, and infrastructure. In addition, Castle Point should seek to maximise opportunities relating to the estuary as an economic growth opportunity, recognising its potential for trade and associated employment benefits.		

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0219-0005	Individual	Graham	Bracci		Yes	GB1	Yes	CPBC Plan Page 126 5.01 We welcome and support the CPBC Plan's desire to protect the Borough's Green Belt. However we are most concerned at some of the findings contained in the Castle Point Green Belt Assessment. 5.02 The broader functions of the Canvey Island Green Belt, beyond the official Purposes, have received little importance and weight. It is apparent that the CPBC Plan indicates little enough weight given to assets included within areas GB1, GB2 and GB3. 5.03 We consider that the latest CPBC Green Belt Assessment is wrong to indicate that Parcels GB1 and GB2 in particular, should be identified as potential Grey Belt. Both Parcels meet the PPG criteria to remain as Green Belt. 5.04 Annex 2 of the NPPF defines Grey Belt Land, as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143 of the NPPF. 5.05 Quite clearly GB1 and GB2, Very Strongly contribute to Purpose a) to	No	Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy	Summary Statement This representation is submitted in response to the Regulation 19 consultation on the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan 2026–2043. It is our view that the Plan fails all four tests of soundness as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Plan is underpinned by incomplete evidence, lacks consequence-based risk analysis, and proposes development in areas where public safety cannot be guaranteed—particularly on Canvey Island. 1. Is the Plan Positively Prepared ? The Plan is not positively prepared to meet the area's objectively assessed development needs in a sustainable manner. It adopts a narrow urban-focused strategy that disproportionately exposes vulnerable communities, particularly on Canvey Island, to extreme risks. The prioritisation of Green Belt land over public safety concerns undermines the integrity of the planning process. The Plan selectively identifies flood risk constraints (Footnote 7) and then actively proposes		Yes	To introduce and explain any extra specific supporting evidence in relation to the matters raised in this submission during the Examination in Public (EiP) process		C	The prioritisation of Green Belt land over public safety concerns undermines the integrity of the planning process. Welcome and support the CPBC Plan's desire to protect the Borough's Green Belt. However we are most concerned at some of the findings contained in the Castle Point Green Belt Assessment. The broader functions of the Green Belt, beyond the official Purposes, have received little importance and weight	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2. Non-Green Belt factors in relation to these sites are considered in the SLAA and SA. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d					
								check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; Canvey Island being the most densely populated area within Castle Point. 5.06 Besides this, GB1, GB2 and GB3 all contribute to Purpose e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. As indicated by the CPBC Plan’s development proposals for Canvey Island. 5.07 Furthermore, these parcels fall within the protections of Footnote 7. Parcel GB1 containing the Dutch Cottage a Listed Building. Parcel GB2 directly abutting a now rare Roman Saltern, a Scheduled Monument, of which Historic England note that in Essex, only a very small number remain. 11 GB2 with a strong boundary at the Southern and Eastern edges marked by the Hill Hall Dyke, a designated Main River. 12 5.08 GB1, GB2 and GB3 all fall within Tidal Flood Zone 3. Within a particularly vulnerable Area, reliant on the Tidal Barriers giving sole protection from Flooding, due to there being a lack of sea wall defence alongside the Benfleet Station area, and the			development in those high-risk areas. The NPPF 2024 explicitly removes the ability for councils to set lower housing targets unless exceptional constraints are proven. While the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey. Conclusion: The Plan does not seek to meet development needs in a sustainable or safe manner. 2. Is the Plan Justified ? The Plan lacks proportionate evidence and fails to consider reasonable alternatives. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) omits site-specific modelling and consequencebased analysis for vulnerable populations. Hazardous installations and port-related activities are inadequately assessed, with no detailed COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards) consequence analysis provided. The plan increases population exposure in the vicinity of known COMAH sites hazard range consequence and flood-prone areas, without demonstrating that safer												the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								vulnerable clay banking sea defence alongside the RSPB land. 5.09 Development within any of these areas should constitute inappropriate development and amount to, reason enough to remain within the Green Belt Boundary and not to be considered Grey Belt. 5.10 We are concerned that these parcels have received a strategic re-branding, GB1, GB2 and GB3. During previous CPBC attempts at Plan- making they have been numbered Area 23 and Area 26. It is reasonable to consider that there may well be a specific reason to draw these areas to prominence within the Borough’s Green Belt parcels, to which we can only conclude what the CPBC Core Strategy Examining Inspector Mr P.Crysell identified as“Local Factors,”remains active and relevant today. Building any housing in flood zone 3, without at least first looking at alternatives, sequentially outside of these high risk areas (in addition to the Comah sites) is indeed unreasonable, having already identified Canvey Island			alternatives were adequately considered. It fails to identify Canvey Island as a single flood cell requiring open space catchment areas for flood mitigation . Whilst the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significant housing development to West Canvey, despite failing to provide the required Level II SFRA Conclusion: The Plan is not based on proportionate evidence and fails to justify its spatial strategy. 3. Is the Plan Effective ? The Plan is not effective or deliverable given the known constraints. Major allocations such as West Canvey Island and the Seaview Road corridor lie within flood zones and lack infrastructure to support emergency planning. Pressures on roads and healthcare are acknowledged but not resolved through binding delivery mechanisms. The primary housing site is not shovel-ready and faces significant delivery time constraints, undermining the Plan’s ability to meet urgent housing needs. Conclusion: The Plan is not						is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. 2018 Green Belt Assessments still form part of the evidence and considered wider areas.		

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
								Brownfield spaces for Housing.			deliverable without significant risk to public safety and infrastructure capacity. 4. Consistent with National Policy ? The Plan fails to meet the housing targets set by the Standard Methodology and does not integrate consequence-based planning for flood risk or hazardous installations. This is contrary to NPPF guidance and Planning Practise Guidance on safe development and resilience. Furthermore, the Plan does not reflect legal duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 or COMAH Regulations to plan for foreseeable emergencies. Conclusion: The Plan is inconsistent with national policy and statutory obligations for riskinformed development. In light of the above, we respectfully request that the Castle Point Local Plan 2026–2043 be withdrawn or substantially revised to address the issues raised in this representation. The Plan must be re-evaluated to ensure it meets the tests of soundness, prioritises public safety, and complies with national policy and legal obligation. Is the Plan Legal ?									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											On the basis that this plan has been constructed by professional planners, we could not consider ourselves qualified to challenge its legality, subsequently we are compelled to respond "YES" to this question. However, this submission sets out to indicate that CPBC draft Reg19 consultation may well prove to be unsound or even illegal, being neither positively prepared nor adequately evidenced. The advice provided at 1.09 and 1.10 of this submission, has not been made lightly and goes some way to support our argument that adopting a wholly no Green Belt development policy, at the expense of public safety is somewhat perverse. Prioritising mainland Green Belt protection without fully accounting for major incident hazard range and the potential for catastrophic flood events on Canvey Island, effectively subdividing the borough’s communities, may make the draft CPBC Plan be deemed not only unreasonable but also unprincipled and corporately illogical.									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0220005	Individual	Steve	Sawkins		Yes	GB1		CPBC Plan Page 1265.01 We welcome and support the CPBC Plan's desire to protect the Borough's Green Belt. However we are most concerned at some of the findings contained in the Castle Point Green Belt Assessment. 5.02 The broader functions of the Canvey Island Green Belt, beyond the official Purposes, have received little importance and weight. It is apparent that the CPBC Plan indicates little enough weight given to assets included within areas GB1, GB2 and GB3. 5.03 We consider that the latest CPBC Green Belt Assessment is wrong to indicate that Parcels GB1 and GB2 in particular, should be identified as potential Grey Belt. Both Parcels meet the PPG criteria to remain as Green Belt. 5.04 Annex 2 of the NPPF defines Grey Belt Land, as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143 of the NPPF. 5.05 Quite clearly GB1 and GB2, Very Strongly contribute to Purpose a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; Canvey Island being the most densely populated area within Castle Point. 5.06 Besides this,	No	Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy	Summary Statement This representation is submitted in response to the Regulation 19 consultation on the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan 2026–2043. It is our view that the Plan fails all four tests of soundness as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Plan is underpinned by incomplete evidence, lacks consequence-based risk analysis, and proposes development in areas where public safety cannot be guaranteed—particularly on Canvey Island. 1. Is the Plan Positively Prepared? The Plan is not positively prepared to meet the area's objectively assessed development needs in a sustainable manner. It adopts a narrow urban-focused strategy that disproportionately exposes vulnerable communities, particularly on Canvey Island, to extreme risks. The prioritisation of Green Belt land over public safety concerns undermines the integrity of the planning process. The Plan selectively identifies flood risk constraints (Footnote 7) and then actively proposes development in those high-risk areas. The NPPF 2024 explicitly removes the ability for councils to set lower		Yes	To introduce and explain any extra specific supporting evidence in relation to the matters raised in this submission during the Examination in Public (EiP) process		C	The prioritisation of Green Belt land over public safety concerns undermines the integrity of the planning process. Welcome and support the CPBC Plan's desire to protect the Borough's Green Belt. However we are most concerned at some of the findings contained in the Castle Point Green Belt Assessment. The broader functions of the Green Belt, beyond the official Purposes, have received little importance and weight	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2. Non-Green Belt factors in relation to these sites are considered in the SLAA and SA. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Government's guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
								GB1, GB2 and GB3 all contribute to Purpose e) to assist in urbanregeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. As indicated bythe CPBC Plan’s development proposals for Canvey Island.5.07 Furthermore, these parcels fall within the protections of Footnote 7.Parcel GB1 containing the Dutch Cottage a Listed Building. Parcel GB2 directly abutting anow rare Roman Saltern, a Scheduled Monument, of which Historic England note that inEssex, only a very small number remain. 11GB2 with a strong boundary at the Southern and Eastern edges marked by the Hill Hall Dyke,a designated Main River. 125.08 GB1, GB2 and GB3 all fall within Tidal Flood Zone 3. Within a particularly vulnerableArea, reliant on the Tidal Barriers giving sole protection from Flooding, due to there being alack of sea wall defence alongside the Benfleet Station area, and the vulnerable clay bankingsea defence alongside the RSPB land.5.09 Development within any of these areas should constitute inappropriate development andamount to, reason enough to remain within the Green Belt Boundary and not to be consideredGrey Belt.5.10 We are concerned			housing targets unless exceptional constraints are proven. While thePlan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocates significanthousing development to West Canvey.Conclusion: The Plan does not seek to meet development needs in a sustainable or safemanner.2. Is the Plan Justified ?The Plan lacks proportionate evidence and fails to consider reasonable alternatives. TheStrategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) omits site-specific modelling and consequencebasedanalysis for vulnerable populations. Hazardous installations and port-related activitiesare inadequately assessed, with no detailed COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards)consequence analysis provided.The plan increases population exposure in the vicinity of known COMAH sites hazard rangeconsequence and flood-prone areas, without demonstrating that safer alternatives wereadequately considered. It fails to identify Canvey Island as a single flood cell requiring openspace catchment areas for flood mitigation.Whilst the Plan identifies such constraints on Canvey Island, it paradoxically allocatessignificant housing								the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
								that these parcels have received a strategic re-branding, GB1, GB2and GB3. During previous CPBC attempts at Plan-making they have been numbered Area 23and Area 26. It is reasonable to consider that there may well be a specific reason to drawthese areas to prominence within the Borough’s Green Belt parcels, to which we can onlyconclude what the CPBC Core Strategy Examining Inspector Mr P.Crysell identifiedas“Local Factors,”remains active and relevant today. Building any housing in flood zone 3,without at least first looking at alternatives, sequentially outside of these high risk areas (inaddition to the Comah sites) is indeed unreasonable, having already identified Canvey IslandBrownfield spaces for Housing.			development to West Canvey, despite failing to provide the requiredLevel II SFRAConclusion: The Plan is not based on proportionate evidence and fails to justify its spatialstrategy.3. Is the Plan Effective ?The Plan is not effective or deliverable given the known constraints. Major allocations suchas West Canvey Island and the Seaview Road corridor lie within flood zones and lackinfrastructure to support emergency planning. Pressures on roads and healthcare areacknowledged but not resolved through binding delivery mechanisms.The primary housing site is not shovel-ready and faces significant delivery time constraints,undermining the Plan’s ability to meet urgent housing needs.Conclusion: The Plan is not deliverable without significant risk to public safety andinfrastructure capacity.4. Consistent with National Policy ?The Plan fails to meet the housing targets set by the Standard Methodology and does notintegrate consequence-based planning for flood risk or hazardous installations. This iscontrary to NPPF guidance and Planning Practise Guidance on safe development andresilience.Furthermore, the Plan does not reflect								under policy GB2.Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. 2018 Green Belt Assessments still form part of the evidence and considered wider areas.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											legal duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 orCOMAH Regulations to plan for foreseeable emergencies.Conclusion: The Plan is inconsistent with national policy and statutory obligations for riskinformeddevelopment. In light of the above, we respectfully request that the Castle PointLocal Plan 2026–2043 be withdrawn or substantially revised to address the issues raised inthis representation. The Plan must be re-evaluated to ensure it meets the tests of soundness,prioritises public safety, and complies with national policy and legal obligation.Is the Plan Legal ?On the basis that this plan has been constructed by professional planners, we could notconsider ourselves qualified to challenge its legality, subsequently we are compelled torespond "YES" to this question.However, this submission sets out to indicate that CPBC draft Reg19 consultation may wellprove to be unsound or even illegal, being neither positively prepared nor adequatelyevidenced.The advice provided at 1.09 and 1.10 of this submission, has not been made lightly and goessome way to support our argument that adopting a wholly no Green Belt development policy,at the expense of public safety is								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											somewhat perverse.Prioritising mainland Green Belt protection without fully accounting for major incidenthazard range and the potential for catastrophic flood events on Canvey Island, effectivelysubdividing the borough's communities, may make the draft CPBC Plan be deemed not onlyunreasonable but also unprincipled and corporately illogical.								
0 2 8 2 - 0 0 3 7	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	GB 1	No	Not consistent with National Policy	No	Consistent with National Policy	ECC seek Criteria 1 is amended to provide clarity that inappropriate development in the Green Belt will not be supported except in very special circumstances for consistency with NPPF, paragraph 17.14.	ECC require Criteria 1 is amended to read: Within the Green Belt, as defined on the Policies Map, inappropriate development will not be supported except in very special circumstances.	Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie d 8 addi ton al app endi ces con taini	B	Request amendment to policy to include that development would be accepted in special circumstances within Green Belt	Accepted. Text amended.	1. Develop ment Within the Green Belt, as defined on the Policies Map, inappropri ate develop

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
															ng various pieces of evidence				ment will not be supported except in very special circumstances in line with the NPPF.
0282-0038	Organisation	Kevin	Frasier	Essex County Council	Yes	GB1	Not Stated		No	Effective	Policy GB1, Criteria 1 states that the Green Belt boundaries are defined on the Policies Map and that development within the Green Belt will not be supported in line with the NPPF. ECC requires that school sites are removed from the Green Belt, where appropriate to enable any future school expansion necessary to meet pupil demand not being required to demonstrate an 'exceptional circumstance' to development in the Green Belt. Any school sites removed from the Green Belt should then be allocated as education land on the Policies Map. This is consistent with Paragraph 43 of the Inspectors Report to the 'withdrawn' Local Plan. Please refer to the response regarding amendments to the Policies Map ECC seek reference is made in Paragraph 17.9 to identify those school sites to be removed from the Green Belt and the	ECC supports the recommendations of the Inspector into the 'withdrawn' Local Plan and the recommendations of the Green Belt Assessment, Schools in the Green Belt. ECC require paragraph 17.9 is amended to provide commentary with regards the status of the school sites which ECC seek are removed from the Green Belt consistent with the Inspectors Report (Paragraph 43) and Main Modification 67 to the 'withdrawn' Local Plan	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Request amendment to policy to include that development would be accepted in special circumstances within Green Belt Requires that the following School Sites are removed from Green Belt in order to expand if necessary and allocated as education land.	Not accepted. The Castle Point Plan is a new plan and has been prepared in different circumstances to the previous withdrawn plan. The new plan proposes a new housing strategy of urban intensification consequently the Green Belt becomes more significant as the Green Belt tightly bounds the existing urban areas and there is limited green space in Castle Point. As all these sites are within designated	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											realignment of the green belt boundary consistent with the Main Modification 67 to the `withdrawn` Local Plan and consistent with the Inspector’s recommendation. These school sites were: • King John School, Benfleet; • The Deanes School, Benfleet; • Glenwood School, Benfleet; • Kents Hill Infants and Junior School, Benfleet; • Holy Family Catholic Primary School, Benfleet; • Robert Drake Primary School, Benfleet; • Canvey Skills Campus / Procat, Canvey Island; and • Cornelius Vermuyden, Canvey Island.						• Cornelius Vermuyden, Canvey Island. This would be consistent with the main modification 67 to the withdrawn Local Plan.	Green Belt, the Council considers that further development of these sites is not acceptable.	
0343-0007	Agent	Ben	Weedall	Gladman Developments Ltd		GB 1	Not Stated	In conjunction with the commentary on Policy SP3 – Meeting Development Needs outlined above, Gladman note that Council position that: Development of Grey Belt land is permissible where development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan, where there is a need for the development proposed, where the site is sustainably located with good access to services and transport choices, and where high levels of affordable housing.								B	The policy should be amended to reflect national policy and support grey belt development.	Noted Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2. Development decisions will be informed by consideration of the NPPF in it's entirety. The Council has undertaken a Green	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
								infrastructure and open space provision are secured. 4.1.7 The supporting text considers grey belt land and notes that “Development of Grey Belt land is permissible where development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan, where there is a need for the development proposed, where the site is sustainability located with good access to services and transport choices, and where high levels of affordable housing, infrastructure and open space provision are secured”. This consideration is not reflected within the policy itself which does not mention grey belt within it – the policy should be amended to reflect national policy and support grey belt development. 4.1.0 As detailed in the policy, we also note that certain exceptions exist which regard development in the Green Belt to not be inappropriate and that development should not approved unless very special circumstances exist, where potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of the inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from												Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Government's guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. As discussed, Castle Point Borough Council previously proposed to allocate Green Belt Land for residential development. Evidence submitted to justify this approach was supported by the Council and the plan underwent examination between May and June 2021 with the examining Inspector providing their report on the plan in March 2022 finding the plan sound.										heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. 2018 Green Belt Assessments still form part of the evidence and considered wider areas.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0992-0004	Agent	Timothy	Manana	Hillside Enterprises c/o WSP	Yes	GB1	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Policy GB1 Development sets out that development within the Green Belt will not be supported in line with the NPPF (2024) and that the Council will look to positively preserve the Green Belt. Paragraph 17.12 sets out that development of Grey Belt land is permissible 'where development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan, where there is a need for the development proposed, where the site is sustainably located with good access to services and transport choices, and where high levels of affordable housing, infrastructure and open space provision are secured.' The Council has failed to properly assess and identify Green and Grey Belt sites within the draft Local Plan, and therefore the selection of potential housing allocation sites represents an unsound approach to site selection accordingly. In the withdrawn 2016 and 2019 plans, as well as within the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan, the Council recognised that significant Green Belt releases were required in order to meet its needs. Paragraph 147 of the NPPF (2024) says that Local Authorities should be able to		No	Not Answered	Yes	B - see additional supporting evidence	The Council has failed to properly assess and identify Green and Grey Belt sites within the draft Local Plan	All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Development decisions will be informed by consideration of the NPPF in its entirety. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											demonstrate the need for development within the review of the Green Belt boundaries and plans should give priority to previously developed land as well as Grey Belt. We would urge Castle Point to reflect on the above to accord with the NPPF (2024).							together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. 2018 Green Belt Assessments still form part of the evidence and considered wider areas.	
0332-003	Agent	Corin	Williams	Icen i OBO The Inne r Lon don Gro up		GB 1	No	Inner London object to Policy GB1 on the grounds that it is not consistent with national policy is therefore unsound in accordance with Paragraph 36(d) of the NPPF. Point 1 of the policy states that “Development with the Green Belt, as defined on the policies map, will not be supported in line with the NPPF”. This is an inaccurate	No	Consistent with National Policy	Policy GB1 fails to acknowledge the differences between inappropriate and not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the fact that when development is proposed which is inappropriate, it will not be permitted except where a Very Special Circumstances case is demonstrated. Another way					B	Policy GB1 – <u>Development affecting the Green Belt</u> Object to Policy GB1 on the grounds that it is not consistent with national policy is therefore unsound in accordance with Paragraph 36(d) of	Grey Belt assessment of Land south of Charfleets noted. Policy GB1 – Development affecting the Green Belt Development decisions will	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								reading of national policy which actually states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the exceptions outlines in paragraph 154 applies.			in which development can be regarded as not inappropriate in the Green Belt is if it is located on land which meets the definitions of Grey Belt and the criteria set out at NPPF Paragraph 155. Again, there is no reference to Grey Belt land in this policy, only in the supporting text, where a short description of NPPF Paragraph 155 is provided. 2.24 Castle Point is required to review the Green Belt as part of the Local Plan process and identify exceptional circumstances which justify changes to Green Belt boundaries (Paragraph 147 of the NPPF). Paragraph 146 of the NPPF states that Exceptional circumstances include, but are not limited to, instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes, commercial or other development through other means [emphasis added]. As has been established by this response and its supporting Appendices, there is a proven shortfall between the council's identified housing need and the target set out in the draft plan of 5,721 and an anticipated shortfall of 11.9ha of employment land – established by Appendix A. 2.25 Policy GB1 needs to be amended to clearly explain that this protection should only be extended to land which contributes strongly to						the NPPF. Point 1 of the policy states that “Development with the Green Belt, as defined on the policies map, will not be supported in line with the NPPF”. This is an inaccurate reading of national policy which actually states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the exceptions outlines in paragraph 154 applies. Grey Belt assessment of Land south of Charfleets attached seperately.	be informed by consideration of the NPPF in it's entirety. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											purposes (a), (b) and (d) as set out in Paragraph 143 of the NPPF. As outlined in the introduction of these representations, the Land South of Charfleets site (Parcel GB3 / Site 39926) was assessed by the latest Green Belt Assessment to make a weak / moderate contribution to purpose (a), a weak contribution to purpose (b) and a moderate contribution to purpose (c). As such, the site is listed in Table 12 of the Green Belt Assessment as being “potential Grey Belt upon consideration of Green Belt purposes a) and b)” which makes it a prime candidate to be released for development in terms of having an impact on the wider Green Belt. Icení has undertaken a full Grey Belt Review of the site which speaks to these points and is attached at Appendix B. Policy GB1 fails to recognise that Green Belt parcels can vary in terms of their contributions and appropriateness for development, instead stating that all development on Green Belt, regardless of its assessment in the Green Belt Review, is inappropriate. In doing this it does not align with national policy and therefore must be found unsound.							heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. 2018 Green Belt Assessments still form part of the evidence and considered wider areas.	
0794-0008	Individual	Daniel	Adams		Yes	GB1	Yes		Yes		It's vital we protect the green belt across the borough with any housing development only in very select locations. Housing in the lower grade green belt in north Thundersley is the most viable area for development as the green belt there is less used, has less wildlife and is close to the main highway network of A130/A127 at Fairglen interchange. This should be incorporated into the plan.		Not Answered	Not Answered		A	Protect the Green Belt Release North West Thundersley	Green Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	
0988-0006	Agent			Persimmon Homes Ltd c/o Pegasus Group	Yes	GB1	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	6.1. Criterion 1 is currently not consistent with the NPPF. It is not the case, as implied by the current wording of the policy, that development on Green Belt land is only possible if allocated by a development plan. NPPF paragraphs 154 and 155 set out the exceptions where development is not regarded as being inappropriate in the Green Belt, and paragraph 153 establishes that inappropriate development can be approved where Very Special Circumstances exist.	6.2. Criterion 1 should be amended as follows: 6.3. Development proposals within the Green Belt, as defined on the Policies Map, will assessed in accordance with the relevant NPPF provisions. 6.4. The consistency of Policy GB2 (relating to previously developed land) with the NPPF also needs to be considered by the Council.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Is of the view that it is not consistent with the NPPF	The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. 2018 Green Belt Assessments still form part of the evidence and considered wider areas.	
0 9 3 7 - 0 0 0	Individual	Jon ath an	Pinn ock		Yes	GB1	Yes		Ye s		Protection of the Green Belt and maintaining the natural environment should take priority over any new development in Castle Point		No t An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed		A	Supports Policy GB1	Support noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
07																			
1421-0001	Organisati on	Mar k	Silve rma n	Star Plan s Ltd	Yes	GB 1	No	To whom it may concern, Thank you for providing a further opportunity for comments to be provided on the Regulation 19 draft Castle Point Local Plan (2026-2043). I am writing on behalf of the Jewish Community of Canvey Island (JCOCI) Educational Foundation. The JCOCI site on Meppel Avenue is the principal hub for the Jewish community on Canvey Island and has benefited from significant investment since being acquired by the community in 2016. The 'urban first' approach in the draft plan is noted along with paragraph 6.33 which states that the plan "seeks to protect the Green Belt in line with the outcomes of the Green Belt Assessment". The draft plan and its accompanying policies map, however, do not reflect the recommendations of the Council's own Green Belt Assessment (July 2025) with regard to the 'potential major anomalies' identified in the report, including MAGB14 (USP College XTEND Digital Campus and Jewish Community and School, Canvey Island) and the recommended removal of 2.8ha of land at Meppel Avenue from the Green Belt.	No		The justification for the removal of MAGB14 is set out in Appendix A and recognises that the majority of the site is developed for educational use. The report notes "that an alteration was sought to the Green Belt boundary in this location within the Borough's previous and withdrawn Local Plan. The Inspector's final report (03.03.22) concluded in paragraph 43 that exceptional circumstances exist for the removal of this area from the Green Belt, although it was concluded that there were no exceptional circumstances to remove the playing fields to the North from the Green Belt." There is no justification for retaining the site in the Green Belt and as such, that aspect of the plan would fail to meet the tests of soundness. JCOCI therefore objects to Policy GB1 – Development affecting the Green Belt which states that "Development within the Green Belt, as defined on the Policies Map, will not be supported in line with the NPPF" (emphasis added). Removal of the site from the Green Belt would facilitate any future development on the site to meet the needs of the Jewish community and avoid a need to demonstrate	JCOCI would support a main modification which commits to addressing this anomaly on the Policies Map and would be willing to enter into a Statement of Common Ground with the Council to reflect this.					The JCOCI seeks the removal of Green Belt Parcel MAGB14 from the Green Belt.	Outside of the removal of the Gypsy and Traveller sites and the River Thames there are no removals from the Green Belt. This is inclusive of School Playing Fields.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											that the site is grey belt and/or advance very special circumstances, each time a planning application is submitted.								
1 0 2 7 - 0 0 0 3	Agent	c/o age nt	c/o age nt	Tayl or Wim pey	Yes	GB1	Yes		No	Effective, Consistent with national policy	Policy GB1 is not consistent with the NPPF and should be amended to reflect national policy. Paragraph 153 states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Paragraph 154 notes that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the listed exceptions apply. Policy GB1 is not Sound as it is not consistent with the NPPF or effective. It should be amended to align with the NPPF.	Policy GB1 is not Sound as it is not consistent with the NPPF or effective. It should be amended to align with the NPPF.	Yes	Not Ans wer ed		A	Is of the view that it is not consistent with the NPPF	The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point,	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. 2018 Green Belt Assessments still form part of the evidence and considered wider areas.	
0 2 8 2 - 0 0 3 9	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	GB 2	Not Sta ted		No	Effective	Criteria 1a should also make reference to a site within the 'good' accessibility category of accessibility as there is quite a range between the services provided between a high and moderate accessibility category.	ECC require the following amendment to Criteria 1a to read: The site is in a high, good or moderately accessible location as identified on the map at Appendix D, and has safe footway access, conforming to established highway regulations;	Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie d 8 addi ton al app endi ces con taini ng vari ous piec es of evid enc e	B	More clarity is required over the accessibility category to include "good"	Accepted and additional criteria added	1a. The site is in a high, good or moderately accessible location as identified on the map at Appendix D, and has safe footway access, conforming to established highway

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			regulation s;
0343-0008	Agent	Ben	Weedall	Gladman Developments Ltd		GB2	Not Stated	In conjunction with the commentary on Policy SP3 – Meeting Development Needs outlined above, Gladman note that Council position that: Development of Grey Belt land is permissible where development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan, where there is a need for the development proposed, where the site is sustainably located with good access to services and transport choices, and where high levels of affordable housing, infrastructure and open space provision are secured. 4.1.7 The supporting text considers grey belt land and notes that “Development of Grey Belt land is permissible where development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan, where there is a need for the development proposed, where the site is sustainability located with good access to services and transport choices, and								B	Policy SP3 - further comments on Grey Belt	The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Government's guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to;	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
								where high levels of affordable housing, infrastructure and open space provision are secured”. This consideration is not reflected within the policy itself which does not mention grey belt within it – the policy should be amended to reflect national policy and support grey belt development. 4.1.0 As detailed in the policy, we also note that certain exceptions exist which regard development in the Green Belt to not be inappropriate and that development should not be approved unless very special circumstances exist, where potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of the inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. As discussed, Castle Point Borough Council previously proposed to allocate Green Belt Land for residential development. Evidence submitted to justify this approach was supported by the Council and the plan underwent examination between May and June 2021 with the examining Inspector providing their report on the plan in March 2022 finding the plan sound.											Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. 2018 Green Belt Assessments still form part of the evidence and considered	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		wider areas.	
1 0 2 0 - 0 0 0 5	Organisati on	Ma rk	Behr endt	Ho me Buil ders Fed erati on	Yes	GB2	No		No	Consistent with national policy	Part b. of this policy sets out the policy position in relation to grey belt and how this will be considered. However, NPPF notes that in the glossary that whilst grey bet can be PDL it is also defined as other land that does not strongly contribute to the purposes a, b or d of paragraph 146. Therefore, it would be appropriate for the title of the policy to be amended to “Grey belt and Previously Developed Land in the Green Belt” to ensure that this is clear. Part b. is also inconsistent with NPPF in stating that land identified as grey belt will not undermine the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that land is not appropriate where “the development would utilise grey bet and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes taken together of the remaining Green Belt	See above	Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	Part b. of this policy sets out the policy position in relation to grey belt and how this will be considered. However, NPPF notes that in the glossary that whilst grey bet can be PDL it is also defined as other land that does not strongly contribute to the purposes a, b or d of paragraph 146. Therefore, it would be appropriate for the title of the policy to be amended to “Grey belt and Previously Developed Land in the Green Belt” to ensure that this is clear. Part b. is also inconsistent with NPPF in stating that land identified as grey belt will not undermine the	The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Government's guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											across the plan area”. If a parcel of land is considered to be grey belt, then it is not strongly meeting purposes of a, b or d and the test with regard to it be not inappropriate relates to whether it fundamentally undermines the purposes of green belt across the borough. HBF suggests the policy should be amended to reflect national policy.						purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that land is not appropriate where “the development would utilise grey bet and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes taken together of the remaining Green Belt across the plan area”. If a parcel of land is considered to be grey belt, then it is not strongly meeting purposes of a, b or d and the test with regard to it be not inappropriate relates to whether it fundamentally undermines the purposes of green belt across the borough. HBF suggests the policy should be amended to reflect national policy.	together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0947-0003	Agent	Liam	Ryder	Roscon Group c/o CODE Development Planners Ltd	Yes	GB2	No	Within these representations CODE identify fundamental failings in CPBC's Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in relation to the appropriate consideration of reasonable alternatives. CODE is particularly concerned at the total absence of consideration for the reduced area of land east of Rayleigh Road, Thundersley (site GB13) from consideration within the SA, which is identified in other evidence base documents (including the Green Belt Assessment, July 2025) as potentially meeting the definition of Grey Belt (and thereby not being considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, subject to meeting the NPPF's golden rules). In addition to the substantial concerns regarding the SA, CODE has also identified concerns regarding the lack of clarity over CPBC's accordance with the Duty to Cooperate. The Duty to Cooperate evidence section on the local plan website is limited to one statement of common ground (SOCG) between CPBC and Essex County Council (ECC) in relation to land north west of Thundersley, which is acknowledged within to not be a viable option for	No	Consistent with national policy	Policy GB2 concerns previously developed land in the Green Belt only. Paragraph 17.10 of the supporting text for the policy notes the introduction of Grey Belt policy following the revision to the NPPF in December 2024. At 17.11 of the supporting text notes, "This definition in effect changes how Green Belt is defined. Appendix K sets out the Council's interpretation of key terms within the definition of previously developed land." The policy is inconsistent with the provisions of the NPPF, as it only considers development which comes forward on previously developed land in the Green Belt to 'not constitute inappropriate development.' The NPPF's Grey Belt policy does not exclude greenfield sites from meeting the definition of Grey Belt; for the purposes of plan-making and decision-taking, Grey Belt is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that does not strongly contribute to purposes a), b) and d) of the Green Belt. The wording of the policy is particularly concerning for sites which have been	The policy is inconsistent with national planning policy and should be updated to reflect that residential development in the Green Belt which meets the definition of Grey Belt (and the golden rules) should not be viewed as inappropriate development.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	<u>SA of GB13</u> Within these representations CODE identify fundamental failings in CPBC's Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in relation to the appropriate consideration of reasonable alternatives. CODE is particularly concerned at the total absence of consideration for the reduced area of land east of Rayleigh Road, Thundersley (site GB13) from consideration within the SA, which is identified in other evidence base documents (including the Green Belt Assessment, July 2025) as potentially meeting the definition of Grey Belt (and thereby not being considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, subject to meeting the NPPF's golden rules). <u>Duty to Cooperate and Statements of Common Ground</u>	<u>SA of GB13</u> Site GB13 was assessed in the SA. <u>Duty to Cooperate</u> Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. <u>Green Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. Where the Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
								allocation in the current local plan (and nor was it appropriate for allocation in the previously withdrawn local plan). It is difficult to establish CPBC’s correspondence and cooperation with its neighbours regarding requests to accommodate some of CPBC’s need, particularly in light of the statements made within the Castle Point Plan, and across the evidence base, regarding perceived local constraints which (in CPBC’s view) excludes Green Belt sites from consideration for allocation. Indeed, paragraph 28 of the NPPF states, “In order to demonstrate effective and on-going joint working, strategic policy-making authorities should prepare and maintain one or more statements of common ground, documenting the cross-boundary matters being addressed and progress in cooperating to address these.” The NPPF further clarifies that such statements of common ground should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. The publication of one statement of common ground which relates to a			identified to meet the definition of Grey Belt within the evidence base supporting the Castle Point Plan, such as land east of Rayleigh Road, Thundersley (site reference GB13a), which is identified within the Green Belt Assessment for Castle Point Borough Council (July 2025) as potentially meeting the definition of Grey Belt. If Rosconn Group were to bring forward a planning application on the site which meets the definition of Grey Belt, in accordance with paragraph 155 of the NPPF (and, additionally the golden rules outlined in paragraphs 156 and 157) the scheme would not be able to comply with policy GB2 (and, by association, policy GB1 – Development affecting the Green Belt). The policy is therefore inconsistent with national planning policy and should be updated to reflect that residential development in the Green Belt which meets the definition of Grey Belt (and the golden rules) should not be viewed as inappropriate development.								The Duty to Cooperate evidence section on the local plan website is limited to one statement of common ground (SOCG) between CPBC and Essex County Council (ECC) in relation to land north west of Thundersley, which is acknowledged within to not be a viable option for allocation in the current local plan (and nor was it appropriate for allocation in the previously withdrawn local plan). It is difficult to establish CPBC’s correspondence and cooperation with its neighbours regarding requests to accommodate some of CPBC’s need, particularly in light of the statements made within the Castle Point Plan, and across the evidence base, regarding perceived local constraints which (in CPBC’s view) excludes Green Belt sites from consideration for allocation.	appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required			
								specific part of the borough, and which is not included in the local plan for consideration as an allocation is not sufficient to demonstrate appropriate co-operation with neighbouring authorities. It is noted within the officer’s report to Special Council (for the meeting on 23 July 2025) that “The key issue which is to be finalised is a final decision from adjoining and nearby councils on whether they can accept any of the unmet need from Castle Point (between 4,736 and 6,511 dwellings). This can only be completed once the Council has published its Regulation 19 draft Castle Point Plan and has specified the level of unmet need.” However, it is important to note paragraph 26 of the NPPF which stipulates, “Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary, and whether development needs that cannot be met wholly within a particular area could be met												<u>Policy GB2</u> The policy is inconsistent with the provisions of the NPPF, as it only considers development which comes forward on previously developed land in the Green Belt to ‘not constitute inappropriate development.’ The NPPF’s Grey Belt policy does not exclude greenfield sites from meeting the definition of Grey Belt; for the purposes of plan-making and decision-taking, Grey Belt is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that does not strongly contribute to purposes a), b) and d) of the Green Belt. The wording of the policy is particularly concerning for sites which have been identified to meet the definition of Grey Belt within the evidence base supporting the Castle Point Plan.		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								elsewhere.” The Duty to Cooperate is a gateway test for the soundness and legal compliance of a local plan. In light of the requirements of paragraph 26 of the NPPF, it is not acceptable to seek to satisfy the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate post-submission as joint working between strategic policy making authorities should have been undertaken throughout the preparation of the Castle Point Plan and cannot be applied retrospectively.									such as land east of Rayleigh Road, Thundersley (site reference GB13a), which is identified within the Green Belt Assessment for Castle Point Borough Council (July 2025) as potentially meeting the definition of Grey Belt.		
1 4 4 0 - 0 0 2 0	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	GB 2	Yes		No	Justified	Our comment on Policy GB2 is around the need to clarify that biodiverse brownfield and open mosaic habitat on previously developed land is exempt. The Essex LNRS mentions repeatedly the potential for brownfield sites to be biodiverse and hold scarce species. For example, 6.6, Urban p.136: brownfield sites — ‘disused developed land’ can serve as both a valuable wild space for nearby communities and a refuge for a variety of priority invertebrates. Also 14. Understand existing	A sentence needs to be added to Policy GB2 to clarify that biodiverse brownfield and open mosaic habitat on previously developed land will not be considered appropriate for new development.	No				Our comment on Policy GB2 is around the need to clarify that biodiverse brownfield and open mosaic habitat on previously developed land is exempt. The Essex LNRS mentions repeatedly the potential for brownfield sites to be biodiverse and hold scarce species. For example, 6.6, Urban p.136:	2018 Green Belt Assessments still form part of the evidence and considered wider areas.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											local habitats and species, p.140: 'Assess the existing biodiversity and connectivity of areas under your management as an important first step to creating new spaces for wildlife and protecting the wider environment. Monitor biodiversity on brownfield sites as they can often become important habitats for invertebrates and early successional communities.' Also, Priority Species – Shrill Carder Bee, p.194: 'Manage and protect brownfield sites, and maintain mosaic of habitats within them by rotational clearance of vegetation.' Also: 8.2 Grassland and Meadows, p.202: 'Flower-rich grassland is often an important component of open mosaic habitats, such as those found on aggregates sites and previously developed land (brownfield).'						brownfield sites — ‘disused developed land’ can serve as both a valuable wild space for nearby communities and a refuge for a variety of priority invertebrates. Also 14. Understand existing local habitats and species, p.140: 'Assess the existing biodiversity and connectivity of areas under your management as an important first step to creating new spaces for wildlife and protecting the wider environment. Monitor biodiversity on brownfield sites as they can often become important habitats for invertebrates and early successional communities.' Also, Priority Species – Shrill Carder Bee, p.194: 'Manage and protect brownfield sites, and maintain mosaic of habitats within them by rotational clearance of vegetation.' Also: 8.2 Grassland and Meadows, p.202: 'Flower-rich		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	grassland is often an important component of open mosaic habitats, such as those found on aggregates sites and previously developed land (brownfield).' A sentence needs to be added to Policy GB2 to clarify that biodiverse brownfield and open mosaic habitat on previously developed land will not be considered appropriate for new development.		
1 0 2 7 - 0 0 0 4	Agent	c/o age nt	c/o age nt	Tayl or Wim pey	Yes	GB2	Yes		No	Consistent with national policy	In the heading Policy GB2 states 'previously developed land', whereas the policy also covers grey belt land and, as made clear in the glossary of the NPPF, that does not need to be just previously developed. The heading should be changed to reflect what the policy covers. Point 1b should also be amended to reflect the wording in paragraph 155a of the NPPF namely '...not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan'. This should also allow for the potential scope to make the case that a site is grey belt, even if it	See above - Policy GB2 is not Sound, as it is not consistent with the NPPF. It should be amended to reflect the NPPF.	Yes	Not Ans wer ed		A	In the heading Policy GB2 states 'previously developed land', whereas the policy also covers grey belt land and, as made clear in the glossary of the NPPF, that does not need to be just previously developed. The heading should be changed to reflect what the policy covers. Point 1b should also be amended to reflect the wording in paragraph 155a of the NPPF namely '...not	Grey Belt is addressed across the Green Belt policies and is not specific to GB2. Part B reflects the NPPF without duplicating it which is not the purpose of a Local Plan Part e ensures the proposals comply with other policies in the plan which is considered necessary.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											is not identified in the Green Belt Review as this does not review all of the Green Belt land comprehensively (paragraphs 1.1.3 and 5.1.1 of the Green Belt Assessment 2025). Part e is not required. Policy GB2 is not Sound, as it is not consistent with the NPPF. It should be amended to reflect the NPPF.						fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan’. This should also allow for the potential scope to make the case that a site is grey belt, even if it is not identified in the Green Belt Review as this does not review all of the Green Belt land comprehensively (paragraphs 1.1.3 and 5.1.1 of the Green Belt Assessment 2025). Part e is not required. Policy GB2 is not Sound, as it is not consistent with the NPPF. It should be amended to reflect the NPPF.			
0282-0077	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	Glossary	Not Stated		No	Effective	ECC seek amendment to the Glossary to provide clarification that education is not defined as being community use and thereby subject to Policy Infra1. Educational establishments and libraries should be protected for their existing use and any change of use only permitted if it has been identified by ECC or other educational providers as	ECC require the Glossary is amended to delete the following from the definition of Community Facilities. • Schools, Colleges and other educational facilities • Libraries and community centres • Child care centres	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices con	B	For Education not be defined as a community use in the glossary	Accepted and Schools, colleges and Educational Facilities be removed from community use definition in glossary	Community Facilities : Are buildings, which enable a variety or local activity to take place includin	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											being surplus to educational requirements consistent with Policy Infra2. The Glossary refers to schools, colleges and other educational facilities; Childcare centres and libraries as being community uses and therefore subject to Policy Infra1, which should be deleted. These uses should be covered by Policy Infra2– Education, Skills and Learning.				taini ng vari ous piec es of evid enc e				g, but not limited to, the following : • Schools, Colleges and other educational facilities • Libraries and community centres
0343-0002	Agent	Ben	Weedall	Gladman Developments ltd		Green Belt Assessment	No	3.3.1 An up-to-date assessment of the Green Belt has been undertaken to support preparation of the Plan. This Green Belt Assessment (GBA) concludes that 12 sub-areas are recommended for further consideration by the Council in the plan making process. 3.3.2 It is not clear where this further consideration has taken place and this must be appropriately evidenced. 3.3.3 Land at Glebelands is one site assessed by the GBA (GB4), it is found to have a moderate contribution to purpose a) and a weak contribution to purpose b). Gladman agree with this	No							B	The Green Belt Assessment (GBA) concludes that 12 sub-areas are recommended for further consideration by the Council in the plan making process. It is not clear where this further consideration has taken place and this Land at Glebelands is one site assessed by the GBA (GB4), it is found to have a moderate contribution to purpose a) and a weak contribution to purpose b). Gladman agree with this position.	Green Belt options were given specific consideration in the Green Belt Assessment evidence. All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								position. 3.3.4 The GBA goes on to identify 19 sub areas could be defined as grey belt due to the performance against purposes a) and b). Purpose d is not assessed as there is no historic towns within the authority. 3.3.5 Land off Glebelands is correctly identified as ('potential') Grey Belt following consideration of purposes a) and b).									The GBA goes on to identify 19 sub areas could be defined as grey belt due to the performance against purposes a) and b). Purpose d is not assessed as there is no historic towns within the authority. Land off Glebelands is correctly identified as ('potential') Grey Belt following consideration of purposes a) and b).	y Appraisal (SA).	
0282-0017	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	Had 1	Not Stated		Yes		ECC support reference to opportunities for urban greening in the town centre (Criteria 8). Town centres present a valuable opportunity for urban greening, which can enhance public spaces, improve biodiversity, and support climate resilience. This could include greening streets, creating attractive and welcoming town squares, and integrating green infrastructure into new developments. Further, supporting justification could be provided in the reasoned justification outlining how this will be delivered, consistent with paragraph 18.32		Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	EEC supports this policy and reference to opportunities for urban greening in Hadleigh Town Centre	Accepted and additional text referring to urban greening added	Improved environmental conditions including urban greening can help the attractiveness of the centre town centre along with an improved evening and leisure offer. Useful

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																			guidanc e can be found in Home - Nature Towns & Cities. A banking hub is also desired to enable resident s and local business es to have access to shared banking services.
0 2 8 2 - 0 0 1 8	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	Had 1	Not Sta ted		No	Effective	To provide consistency with other policies in the Plan and to ensure that any masterplan has regard to the guidance and standards set out in the EPOA Parking Guidance.	ECC require Criteria 6 is amended to read: A car parking strategy that provides the level of car parking required to meet foreseen demand and accessibility between commercial areas and car parking having regard to the EPOA Parking Guidance.	Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie d 8 addi ton al app endi ces con taini ng vari ous piec es of evid	B	Masterplan of this site should have regard for the EPOA Parking Guidance for this policy	Accepted and additional text added to reference EPOA Parking Guidance	6. A car parking strategy that provides the level of car parking required to meet foreseen demand and accessib ility between comm ercial areas and car parking

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
															ence				having regard to the EPOA Parking Guidance. 11. Development proposals must be designed to protect and enhance enable and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).
0312	Individual	Jill	Walsh		Yes	Had 1	No		No	Not Stated	HAD1 -Page 66 This policy in my opinion is unsound Further urbanisation of Hadliegh town centre will		Not Stated		No		Policy Had1: Objects as unsound and Highwayss impacts. Concern	Had1: Paragraph 19.39 of the Plan confirms	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 2											result in traffic flow coming to a virtual standstill, unless the necessary infrastructure is already in place, which it clearly will not be. The suggestion of development of the Hadleigh Island would seem to suggest the removal of the Library - a community meeting place which is well utilised, not just for borrowing books but also by various groups within the community including the Community fridge, as well as access to computers, printing facilities (again, both well utilised) and would be a great loss to the community.						about possible loss of library. Canvey: Objects to level of development on Canvey. Concerns on access, 2 COMAH sites	that 'The Council will work closely with ECC to ensure ongoing access to library services for residents'. Part3 of Policy Had1 confirms that community facilities and cultural uses will be included in the scheme. Paragraph 10.16 states there is scope 'to better provide the community uses'.	
0 9 9 4 - 0 0 0 2	Agent	Bar ry	Veat er	Gov reso urce s Ltd OBO Barr y Veat er	Yes	HA D1	Yes		No	Consistent with national policy	Policy Had2 is supported with the exception of a missing ingredient, which is the usability of the resulting town centre for sustainable active travel and for those less able. It is essential that Policy Had2 considers how residents and visitors will move around in the intensified town centre.	Add a criterion, borrowing from T2 - Active travel improvements, to ensure development on e.g. Castle Lane Car Park retains access through the site resulting in an attractive walking/cycling environment to Hadleigh Castle. It is similarly important that The Island Site includes safe and accessible crossing points so elderly or infirm residents do not have to walk around the site to reach the facilities beyond it and do not risk crossing without the protection of proper pedestrian crossing points.	No	Not Ans wer ed			Supports policy HAD2 but suggests that it needs to consider sustainable active travel for all around the town centre	Policy HAD2 does not include the town centre. Policy HAD1 includes improvements to active and sustainable travel options and any development will have to accord with Polcies T1-T8 as appropriate.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
033-0001	Organisation	Andrew	Marsh	Historic England		Had 1	Not Stated	We welcome the commitment to preparing a new Hadleigh Town Centre Master Plan, particularly criterion 7, which aims to create an appropriate setting for heritage assets, including the Grade I listed Church of St James the Less. As set out in our Good Practice Advice Note 3 (The Setting of Heritage Assets), the setting of a heritage asset can contribute to its significance, as well as to the ability to appreciate that significance. We therefore welcome the focus on public realm improvements that will help sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets within the town Historic England, Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge CB2 8BU Telephone 01223 582749 historicengland.org.uk Historic England is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any information held by us may therefore become publicly available. For information about our use of your personal data visit: historicengland.org.uk/privacy centre by focusing on those aspects of their setting which make a positive	Not Stated			We welcome the numerous references to the historic environment within this chapter, particularly the reference to the Grade I listed Church of St James the Less and Hadleigh Castle. However, to ensure clarity and consistency, we recommend amending paragraph 10.2 to explicitly state that Hadleigh Castle is both a Scheduled Monument and a listed building, as is already done for the Church of St James the Less. This clarification will help readers fully appreciate the significance of both heritage assets.					We welcome the numerous references to the historic environment within this chapter, particularly the reference to the Grade I listed Church of St James the Less and Hadleigh Castle. However, to ensure clarity and consistency, we recommend amending paragraph 10.2 to explicitly state that Hadleigh Castle is both a Scheduled Monument and a listed building, as is already done for the Church of St James the Less. This clarification will help readers fully appreciate the significance of both heritage assets' We welcome the commitment to preparing a new Hadleigh Town Centre Master Plan, particularly criterion 7, which aims to create an appropriate setting	Modification as follows (bold text additions, strike through deletions). 10.2 Hadleigh Castle (a Scheduled Monument and Grade 1 listed) sits to the south of the town centre and dates to Saxon times. Whilst it is in a ruined state, it is the centrepiece of the Hadleigh Castle Country Park, a major tourist attraction within the Borough which was home to the 2012 Olympic Mountain Biking events.	Y - 10.2 Hadleigh Castle (a Scheduled Monument and Grade 1 listed) sits to the south of the town centre and dates to Saxon times.

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								contribution to their significance.									for heritage assets, including the Grade I listed Church of St James the Less. As set out in our Good Practice Advice Note 3 (The Setting of Heritage Assets), the setting of a heritage asset can contribute to its significance, as well as to the ability to appreciate that significance. We therefore welcome the focus on public realm improvements that will help sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets within the town centre by focusing on those aspects of their setting which make a positive contribution to their significance.		
0382-0002	Individual	Chris	Prentice		Yes	Had 1	Yes	I am surprised and disappointed that this site, which I agree is totally suitable for redevelopment, can only accommodate 388 new homes. The site is well served by public transport and has car parking nearby so I do not see why more homes could not be built? I am told that there is reluctance or resilience from Essex County Council to engage with Castle Point	Yes							A	Would like more homes to be provided on this site. there is reluctance or resilience from Essex County Council to engage with Castle Point with particular regard to including the library and old fire station within the redevelopment.	The density of the site has been informed by the Density and Capacity study, please see this for further information. The Hadleigh Island site which includes the library and the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								with particular regard to including the library and old fire station within the redevelopment. How can our local council be criticised for not creating sufficient new homes when third parties do not support making better use of existing underutilised Brown Field Sites?									How can our local council be criticised for not creating sufficient new homes when third parties do not support making better use of existing underutilised Brown Field Sites?	old fire station is included within HAD1 and the is anticipated to provide 74 homes and 908m2 of non residential floor space.	
1 0 9 2 - 0 0 0 1	Organisati on	Un a	Kipp s	St Jam es the Less Chu rch and as an indi vidu al	Yes	HA D1	Yes		No	Effective	".. to substantially improve the setting of the church" is such a vague statement it is impossible to tell what is meant by this. You're planning to build on the nearest carpark (Castle Lane) used by many church-users, many of whom would have difficulty with the distance from other parking. What else?		No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		What is meant by improving the setting of the church? Concerned at the loss of castle lane car park	As part of the regeneration to Hadleigh Town Centre proposed in policy HAD1 there will be opportunities to respect and engance the setting for the church as a heritage asset The development of the castle lane car park will be done in conjunction with the coordination of parking provision in the town centre to consolidate parking arrangements.	N
1 0 9 2 -	Not Answered	Un a	Kipp s		Not Answ ered	HA D1	Yes		No	Justified	Accessibility in relation to parking and 'Urban first' approach. If the council really wanted to enhance community		No	Not Ans wer ed			Don't build on the car park in hadleigh due to loss of car parking for people	The development of the castle lane car park will be done in	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0003											facilities, it would be considering replacing one of the community halls lost in recent years, and maybe the British Legion site could be developed as a community facility with accompanying parking at ground level and flats above. But the total loss of that car park would be detrimental to the south side of Hadleigh and potentially could further reduce church attendance and therefore viability. The council needs to consider the knock-on effect of its proposals, and I see little evidence of that at present.						accessing the church	conjunction with the coordination of parking provision in the town centre to consolidate parking arrangements.	
0086-0001	Individual	Lacey	Pek		Not Stated	Had 2	No	I wish to raise a serious concern regarding the Castle Point Local Plan Had2 (Regulation 19) consultation.	No	Not Stated	The process for submitting objections is unnecessarily complex, with requirements for specific policy references, page numbers, table references, and map numbers that are extremely difficult for ordinary residents to identify without specialist planning knowledge. This creates a serious barrier to democratic participation and effectively silences opposition by making it almost impossible for residents to respond meaningfully. I believe this approach is deliberate, designed to reduce the number of objections recorded. This is unacceptable and undermines public trust in both the Council and the planning system as a whole. I therefore ask that this		Not Stated		No		I wish to raise a serious concern regarding the Castle Point Local Plan Had2 (Regulation 19) consultation. The process for submitting objections is unnecessarily complex, with requirements for specific policy references, page numbers, table references, and map numbers that are extremely difficult for ordinary residents to identify without specialist planning knowledge. This creates a serious barrier to	Comments noted and placed on record	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											concern is formally acknowledged, recorded, and raised with the Planning Inspectorate. The consultation process should be accessible, fair, and transparent to all residents — not just those with professional planning expertise.						democratic participation and effectively silences opposition by making it almost impossible for residents to respond meaningfully. I believe this approach is deliberate, designed to reduce the number of objections recorded. This is unacceptable and undermines public trust in both the Council and the planning system as a whole. I therefore ask that this concern is formally acknowledged, recorded, and raised with the Planning Inspectorate. The consultation process should be accessible, fair, and transparent to all residents — not just those with professional planning expertise.		
0 2 8 2 -	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty	Yes	Had 2	Not Sta ted		Ye s		ECC welcome reference to support proposals related to the improvement of recreational facilities within the Country Park and its		Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie	B	Supports policy for requiring proposals to improve recreational facilities at Hadleigh	Noted	Develop ment proposal s must be

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 1 9				Cou ncil							maintenance. This is supported by Policy Infra4 – Open Spaces, Criteria 5 which requires major development to make a contribution towards improving the quality, quantity and/or accessibility of nearby open space provision, recognising the impact increased intensity of use may have on that space. ECC consider this is relevant to Hadleigh Country Park in order to mitigate the intensification if uses from development. Development proposals must give consideration to the impact on ECCs Country Parks, including Hadleigh Country Park, and seek to secure infrastructure and/or environmental mitigation as may be set out in appropriate management plans for these Parks. Consideration should also ensure that consideration is given to accessibility to, and within, Country Parks by active and sustainable travel modes, and funding is provided for their longer term maintenance and lifecycle replacement consistent with Policy T3.				d 8 addi tion al app endi ces con taini ng vari ous piec es of evid enc e		Country Park and their maintenance consistent with other policies in the Plan.		designed to protect and enhance enable and support

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
03100002	Individual	Martin	England		Yes	Had 2	No		No	Justified, consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over		Yes	As Head of the Save Hadleigh Farmland Group I would like to put the case forward as to why our site is still at risk with a local plan that will be found unsound	No	A	Had2, for the Hadleigh Farm area needs protection as an open space, promoting the heritage value with the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. We need a C6 Policy (Green lung) for this farmland, the South Hadleigh Green Lung + protection as Local Green Space. Agricultural land: As stated in the agricultural land document date June 2025, just over twenty-one percent of Castle Point's land is in agricultural use, and the remaining agricultural areas in the Castle Point are increasingly fragile but contribute greatly to the Borough's character and will be important to preserve. Also, given that the purpose of preservation is long-term food security, the benefit of preserving agricultural land	Policy Had2 comments noted Agricultural Land See Policy ENV6 and supporting evidence 'Agricultural Land in Castle Point' (June 2025)	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. I do totally agree with the policy Had2, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which talks about this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery (LNRS), biodiversity (APIBs), agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, Site of Specific Scientific Interest, Ramsar site, East Coast Flyway World Heritage site, ecological restoration, habitat creation, and connectivity. This site needs protection as an open space, promoting the heritage value with the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I concur that the Had2 policy is about protecting this greenbelt site as not suitable for development, with			ound, which will then lead to speculative development across our precious Greenbelt sites. Also, the over development with this plan will cause unt			applies regardless. Once the graded agricultural land is lost to development, it is lost forever.		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											respect to urban sprawl, it is a buffer zone, the effect on the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland, protecting the wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting the historic links, and that we should use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. This is confirmed by the Housing Capacity Topic Paper - August 2025, which confirms sites GB8 A&B are not Potential Grey Belt, with that the complete site or sub-areas are not recommended for further consideration. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. The Salvation Army and their developers should be told in no uncertain terms that this farmland is not for development ever. We need a C6 Policy for this farmland, the South Hadleigh Green Lung. The south Hadleigh Green Lung will be protected and enhanced as a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea. Its key role will be connecting ecological			old issues to the local urban areas, when there are viable sites available which have not been seriously considered, like NW Thundersley. Also, as a					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											networks, protecting its ecological value, provide a strategically important ecological corridor, securing a high level of biodiversity net gain, have no adverse impact on the integrity of nearby habitats sites, support the creation of new habitats, through Biodiversity Net Gain, Countryside Stewardship, to support the habitat priority measures, with the nature recovery strategy and as an area of particular Importance for Biodiversity. The Plan's approach to biodiversity and environmental protection needs strengthening and developments should not proceed where it results in significant harm to biodiversity or protected sites unless that harm can be fully mitigated. As stated in the agricultural land document date June 2025, just over twenty-one percent of Castle Point's land is in agricultural use, and the remaining agricultural areas in the Castle Point are increasingly fragile but contribute greatly to the Borough's character and will be important to preserve. Also, given that the purpose of preservation is long-term food security, the benefit of preserving agricultural land applies regardless. Once the graded			Committee Member for the Friends of Canvey Lake group I would like to put the case forward as to why our lake is still at risk with this plan that puts ove					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											agricultural land is lost to development, it is lost forever. This complete site should be included for neighbourhood plans and local green space designation. This is based on the listed assets of community value, visitors, conservation areas, registered historic site, local nature reserve, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, footpaths and cycle routes, country parks, rural footpaths and nature trails, and public rights of way. This site has areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. I can fully support this policy Had2 with no housing development ever on this farmland site, but an unsound plan makes this site a high risk. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative has been consistently dismissed by councillors, on social media, and their own website, without foundation, as a scheme for road access was positively discussed by CPBC, ECC and Basildon Council many years ago, see attached photo. Our councillors say it is not viable, but they have not proposed any plan for this			r thre e tho usa nds hou ses on Can vey Isla nd, but whe n fou nd uns oun d, will lea d to spe cul ativ e dev elo pm ent acr oss our pre cio us Gre enb elt site s, with the					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											site for ECC to review and object to. As a campaign, the Save Hadleigh Farmland Group have their own views and opinions, which have been constantly abused by councillors on social media, to discredit me and the campaign, which continued during the consultation process, even into the last week. The SHF campaign group held a social event, at 2.15pm on Saturday 20th September, to discuss various points including the local plan consultation, and residents were intimidated by three PIP councillors that turned up outside, in an attempt to discredit our opinions, who were handing out their own leaflets was a blatant attempt to undermine public participation in the consultation, to deter residents from providing their views and engaging in the consultation process, thus weakening the plan's justification and effectiveness, see attached photos. This means they only want responses from the community that they approve of and their own leaflet was a fabricated biased view of political ideology, with predetermination set in most paragraphs, if you accept one piece of Greenbelt, you			add itio nal hou ses on our Gre y Belt site s on Can vey, whe n ther e are viab le site s avai labl e whi ch hav e not bee n seri ousl y con side red, like NW Thu nde rsle y.					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											accept them all, and political parties and councillors are fully entitled to have views, which is predisposition, but when that agenda and those views affect your decisions making process it is predetermination, see the leaflet attached. This should be investigated by the inspector.								
0 3 3 3 - 0 0 0 2	Organisati on	An dre w	Mar sh	Hist oric Engl and		Had 2	Not Sta ted	We welcome the supporting text at paragraph 10.20, which acknowledges the site's visual prominence and its role in forming the setting of Hadleigh Castle.	No t Sta ted			However, to ensure this consideration carries appropriate weight in decision making, we recommend that it be incorporated into Policy Had2 as a new criterion. This would give the issue greater prominence and strengthen the protection of the castle's setting and, in turn, its overall significance.					We welcome the supporting text at paragraph 10.20, which acknowledges the site's visual prominence and its role in forming the setting of Hadleigh Castle. However, to ensure this consideration carries appropriate weight in decision	Y - References to Hadleigh Castle and its setting and environmental assets adde to paragraphs a and b (as set out in the Schedule of Mods and Statement of Common Ground)	Y - Referenc es to Hadleigh Castle and its setting and environ mental assets adde to paragrap hs a and

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	making, we recommend that it be incorporated into Policy Had2 as a new criterion. This would give the issue greater prominence and strengthen the protection of the castle's setting and, in turn, its overall significance.		b (as set out in the Schedule of Mods and Statement of Common Ground)
0363-0001	Individual	Jill	Shaw		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 6 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Clif for d	Bish op		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0369-0001	Individual	Susanne	Binskin		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0370001	Individual	Nicholas	Williams		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, puts the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 7 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Roy	Soilleux		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 7 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Will iam	Pers ey		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.					Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 7 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ric har d	Amb rose		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing targetNo five year housing land supplyNorth West ThundersleyGreen/Grey BeltSupports HAD2Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing NeedThe Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point.The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025.Five Year Housing Land SupplyThe Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		housing topic paper.North West ThundersleyNorth West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.Green/Grey BeltThe Council has undertaken a Green Belt	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2.Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		out above. Support for HAD2 Noted.A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 7 4 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Car olin e	Amb rose		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0375-0001	Individual	Linda	White		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, puts the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 7 6 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Bre tt	Hole		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0377-0001	Individual	Gabriele	Peters		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0378-0001	Individual	Geoffrey	Stow		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 7 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Pau line	Sto w		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 8 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Joh n	Mink ey		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0381-0001	Individual	Stephen	Chappel		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.					Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 9 4 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Jun e	Dra per		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No			A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 9 5 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Joanne	Slator		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No			B - see 039 5-000 2	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 9 6 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Joh n	Stod ell		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0397-0001	Individual	John	Harding		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, puts the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No			A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 4 0 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Paul	Dawes		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No			A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 4 0 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Mar ger et	Sha w		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0412-0001	Individual	Christopher	James		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, puts the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	
0 4 2 5 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Jun e	Vinc entJ one s		Yes	Had 2	No	You need to look at alternative areas - out of Hadleigh as we are a grid-lock area already.	No	Justified, consistent with national policy	You are ignoring Greenbelt / Grey areas, brown areas. Why not Thundersley Site. Do not want any housing on the Salvation Army Land - it is farmland, Salvation army want to sell for Housing, they have always been supported locally. As is the need to protect Hadleigh Castle.	Reduce the housing target for this area, particularly Hadleigh/	No			A	Does not support building on HAD2, should consider North West Thundersley instead.	Policy HAD2 does not include any housing development proposals and encourages the use of the area for recreational/agricultural purposes. North West ThundersleyN	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		orth West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	
0 4 2 7 - 0 0	Individual	Sus an	Smit h		Yes	Had 2	No	North Thundersley would be a much more viable proposition! The land for prospective development is too close to a natural heritage site, Roman Fort etc. The land around the Castle is unstable and could	No	Justified, consistent with national policy	I agree that Had2 policy is about protecting greenbelt / farmland and not suitable for development. But the plan for over 6000 homes puts the site at risk particularly our very important heritage site. What about nature	Add North West Thundersley as a more viable solution where traffic can be easily controlled along the A127 (putting in a roundabout) and less congestion on A13 and minor routes.	No				Support for policy HAD2 but concern that the plan for over 6000 homes puts this site at risk for development and suggests north west thundersley	Support noted. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
01								be seriously affected by close building works. Also drainage would be a problem! Added to which, the lack of suitable infrastructure such as congested roads, lack of doctors / dentists / schools - all over crowded and unable to cope already before thousands more houses are built in the area! Farmland is needed, despite what the S.A say, the soil is more than adequate to grow all kinds of crops (rather than importing from abroad!!) We must look after our heritage site - after all we are Castle Point!!			conservation ecological restoration habitat creation? The salvation army purport to be there for the local community but are happy to sell land that will cause distress destruction of the above! Shame on them!!						should be considered.	Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 4 5 7 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Paul	Reed		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.				A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0483-0001	Individual	S	D Wathan		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No		Adoption, Future revisions	A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0484-0001	Individual	J	C Wathan		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No		Adoption, Future revisions	A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 4 8 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ro ber t	Glen ister		Yes	Had 2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recretaional, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultrual, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage sitem the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No		Adop tion, Fut ure revi sion s	A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use of grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	
0 6 5 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Bar ry	Asht on		Yes	HA D2	Yes		Ye s	Justified	Not fully clear enough, to be fully sound. Needs a clear stance on the green belt and that this can never be built upon. (The Salvation Army) As owners of green belt land it is their custodian obligation to protect it. As a council it is also your obligation to protect it, therefore there should be a clear statement of intent	Not fully clear enough, to be fully sound. Needs a clear stance on the green belt and that this can never be built upon. (The Salvation Army) As owners of green belt land it is their custodian obligation to protect it. As a council it is also your obligation to protect it, therefore there should be a clear statement of intent that this land will never be used	Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Needs to be clearer that Green Belt is protected and will never be built on.	The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review,	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											that this land will never be used for property or profit.	for property or profit. Green belt should always remain green for our future generations						backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.	
0681-00	Individual	Ronald	Muat		Yes	HAD2	No	No building on hadleigh ("salvation army fields ") farm	No		Unfair one sided Questionnaire ?	No Building on (salvation army fields) Hadleigh Farm	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		No building on hadleigh farm (salvation army land)	Policy HAD2 safeguards Hadleigh Farm and no development is proposed on this land	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
01																			
0734-0001	Individual	Deborah	Johnstone		Yes	HAD2	No	It concerns me that the number provided in Castle Point's plan as it stands now is much lower than the government's target rate. I appreciate that Castle Point is trying to save all Green Belt land and this is a great thing, but leaves us too much at risk for government intervention and potentially no say in which land is or is not developed. Castle Point should consider large-scale alternatives and I will mention North West Thundersley here since it is such a large site and with the right infrastructure could be really well connected to the A13 and A127 without creating traffic in the area. Same with other infrastructure - schools, GP surgerys, etc - there is sufficient space in NW Thundersley to develop these.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Unfortunately the plan as it stands now, although would be ideal if it were accepted, is so much below the government housing target that it's not consistent with national policy and also doesn't take national guidelines of including green/grey belt sites. North West Thundersley could be an ideal solution here. I appreciate and agree wholeheartedly with exclusion of the Hadleigh Farm area (i.e. the statements around environmental, recreational, biodiversity, agricultural, etc). I feel it's therefore to protect this site by ensuring the Castle Point Plan has a total number of houses more in line with government targets. I link this back to my comment in 2b. re: potential for government intervention and no say about potential build sites.	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, and Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Agree with HAD2 North West Thundersley	Support noted. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 7 5 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	BA RR Y	BUR NET T		Yes	HA D2	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Finally, as a resident I gain much enjoyment from the open spaces and vistas within Castle Point. I must therefore register my strong approval and support for Policy Had 2 within the Castle Point Plan. This is our heritage, and I believe that no changes should be made on these lands which would result in a significant impact on the landscape.		No	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	Support for not building on Hadleigh Farm (HAD2)	Support noted.	N
0 7 7 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bri an	Pal mer		Yes	HA D2	No	Unsound at Reg2	No	Positively prepared	The vision For Hadleigh Farm area,policyHad2. Would cause more road gridlock in the area. And existing roadworks are already unable to repair our broken roads and pavements. The NHS local Health Service cannot cope already with existing locals needs.	Consider the alternative North West Thundersley ie The Blinking Owl. With The option of moving Manor Trading Estate to that area. At present The roads and pavements on this site full of broken surface areas with deep pot holes . This large area providing alternative houses with exit road routes to A127 and A130	No	Not Ans wer ed			Objecting to proposals at HAD2 which would cause more pressure to roads and NHS services North West Thundersley	Policy HAD2 does not include any housing development proposals and encourages the use of the area for recreational/a gricultural purposes. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0804-0001	Individual	Patricia	Slymaker		Yes	HAD2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy. It doesn't meet the housing target for Castle point and site selection, ignores Greenbelt/Grey belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "overdevelopment of Brown field sites", has not considered all sites with no Greenbelt/Grey belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSS1, Ramsay site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development,	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200 with Canvey at 1050 and Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d							
											but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes puts the Hadleigh Farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it’s a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site , the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.														Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council’s aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD2	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0806-0001	Individual	Christine	Lowes		Yes	HAD2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy. It doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point and site selection ignores Greenbelt/Grey belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "overdevelopment of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt/Grey belt sites added and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsay site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development,	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, and Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d							
											but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes puts the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.														Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD2	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 8 2 8 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Keith	Broadhead		Yes	HAD2	Yes		No	Effective	Changes to better define precise meaning.	Suggested text adjustments in added CAPITALS. Within the area as identified on the Policies Map, the Council will support the following land uses and proposals for AGRICULTURAL development: 1. Proposals related to the improvement of recreational facilities within the Country Park and maintenance of the Country Park where they do not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Green Belt, and comply with the requirements of policy ENV4 and other relevant policies of this Plan; 2. NON-RESIDENTIAL OR NON-COMERCIAL proposals related to the development and/or use of the farm for agricultural and/or training purposes in line with the charitable mission of the landowner, where they do not have a significant impact on the landscape the Green Belt, and comply with the requirements of policy ENV4 and other relevant policies of this Plan; or 3. Proposals for habitat creation and habitat management and mitigation which are complementary to the habitats which already	No	Not Answered			More precise wording to policy HAD2	Comment noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												exist on or near the site, with specific regard to the Southend and Benfleet Marshes SPA and Ramsar site. 4. Development proposals must be designed to enable and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). 5. Development proposals must ensure areas that are identified as an Area of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (APIBs) within the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) are protected and where possible enhanced. Reasoned Justification (See 4, next comment for full modification) 10.18 The area to the south of Hadleigh Town Centre sits in the Green Belt. It is the site of the Salvation Army Farm which delivers training opportunities in line with the charitable mission of the Salvation Army. As farming practices change and develop, and the needs of the Salvation Army's clients also change, it will be necessary on occasions for the facilities at the farm to also change and adapt. 10.19 Essex County Council							

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												also manages Hadleigh Country Park. This was extended in 2012 to include land leased from the Salvation Army to provide the venue for the 2012 Olympic Mountain Biking. There are some amenities and facilities on this site for recreation including footpaths, multi-user paths, play equipment, café, toilets, parking, etc. There is also some small-scale ‘glamping’ provision. To ensure the viability of this facility into the long term it will be necessary on occasions for the facilities in the Country Park to change and adapt. 10.20 The site is however visually prominent, and provides the setting for Hadleigh Castle, a Scheduled Monument. It is therefore critical that any development allowed does not NEGATIVELY impact on the landscape. Furthermore, it is important that any recreational or farming activities are compatible with the nature conservation status of the area. 10.21 The southern part of the area is of significant nature conservation value. Benfleet and Southend Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) covers an extensive area of the marshland and Hadleigh Ray creek, with a							

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												smaller area of this designated as a Special Protection Area (SPA) due to its importance as a habitat for birds. It is designated under international law as a Ramsar site due to the number of migratory birds present. Furthermore, the significance of the Hadleigh Castle and Marshes landscape is such that it has been identified as part of the nominated East Coast Flyway World Heritage site. 10.22 The LNRS identifies this area as a Strategic Opportunity Area. The Castle Point Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy recognises the opportunities for remediation and ecological restoration to improve biodiversity in the short term, while habitat creation and improved connectivity between Hadleigh Park and Benfleet Marshes are a longer term aspiration.							
0828-0004	Individual	Keith	Broadhead		Yes	HAD2	Yes		No	Effective	I feel the statement : ' The area to the south of Hadleigh Town Centre sits in the Green Belt. It is the site of the Salvation Army Farm which delivers training opportunities in line with the charitable mission of the Salvation Army. As farming practices change and develop, and the needs of the Salvation Army's clients also change, it	Hadleigh Farm is in the area to the south of Hadleigh Town Centre contained entirely within the Green Belt, which was itself already reduced in size by the effects of an earlier housing development. It is owned by the Salvation Army which produces regular cereal and other crops as well as offering training opportunities in line with its charitable mission.	No	Not Answered			Stronger wording to policy HAD2	Comment noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											will be necessary on occasions for the facilities at the farm to also change and adapt.' should be stronger.	Furthermore, as farming practices change and develop, and the needs of the Salvation Army's clients will also change and it will be necessary on occasions for the farming facilities to also change and adapt.'							
0 8 2 8 - 0 0 0 5	Individual	Keith	Broadhead		Yes	HAD2	Yes		No	Effective	Likely MORAL & ETHICAL CONFLICT between the published Salvation Army INTERNATIONAL POSITIONAL STATEMENT, requiring its commitment to sustainable environmental practices, required to safeguard the integrity of creation. viz. Non destruction of land as created; as against being complicit in building development and the permanent destruction of land.	I fully support the Salvation Army programme of nature-friendly activities including the rewilding and other agricultural use, However, I was naturally aghast that the SA even considered allowing any of the Green Belt land under its protection, to be permanently destroyed, in complete contradiction of the Salvation Army's (SA) published INTERNATIONAL POSITIONAL STATEMENT, If, however, the SA has in fact withdrawn its housing development proposal (Reg 18, call for sites) in favour of retaining the farmland for farming it should be congratulated on its victory of PRINCIPLE over PROFIT. I include below some brief excerpts from the SA website stating its principles: (https://www.salvationist.org.uk/faith/social-justice-peacemaking/positional-statements/caring-environment#:~:text=Search-,INTERNATIONAL%20POSITIONAL%20STATEMENT,Caring%20for%20the%20Environment,-Breadcrumb)	No	Not Answered			No homes on HAD2	No development of housing is proposed to the area covered by policy HAD2.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												Caring for the Environment: Statement of position The Salvation Army believes people are made in the image of God. He has entrusted us to reflect his personality by caring for the Earth and everything in it. The Salvation Army recognises environmental degradation as one of the most pressing issues facing the world today, affecting us all. Its effects fall disproportionately on the most vulnerable, particularly in terms of health, livelihood, shelter and the opportunity to make choices. The very survival of humanity depends on the health of the whole ecosystem. In addition to being compelled by lived experience, The Salvation Army also accepts the scientific evidence that demands action on all levels to lessen the effects of environmental damage. It is committed to sustainable environmental practices which are required to safeguard the integrity of creation. This positional statement was approved by the General in July 2021. I presume that the removal of the offer of sites made by the							

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
												SA in the Reg 18 proposal, it has sensibly decided not to accidentally jeopardise its hard earned and excellent reputation by its retraction. There is no current NEED warranting use of Green Belt farmland currently safeguarded by the Act. The SA publications also proclaim: Our mission, vision and values. Our Values. Integrity We will be honest and transparent in all our dealings with each other and those we serve, being open about our motives and agendas; Mutual accountability We will willingly and freely give full account for our actions to those we interact with and expect the same in return, recognising the link between individual responsibility and mutual accountability. Nature,Birds & Crops [REDACTED Personal Information] and observe PLOT F in Reg 18 on a daily basis. Last year, far from being a non-viable barren field, it yielded 217 cylindrical bales of hay/ fodder together with								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												the associated harvest of multiple trailers full of grain/cereal. In the Spring prior to planting, several hundred Brent Geese arrived and no doubt will regather this Autumn on the plot before migrating to their breeding grounds. Endangered Slow-worms have again been observed. Any farmland/Green Belt surrendered to housing is a permanent, avoidable, and irretrievable Nature . Such actions, if sanctioned, will rightly be condemned by future generations. Please accept that by this comment I seek to highlight that our forefathers by way of Parliament recognised Urban Sprawl as the curse that needed strict control and did so by implementation of The Green Belt (London and Home Counties) Act 1938. This should not be lightly surrendered to Private profit,							

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0834-0002	Individual	Gary	Luckman		Yes	HAD2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing		No	Not Answered		A	No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD3	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 8 3 7 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Bar bar a	Bur nett		Yes	HA D2	No	The plan does not appear to make provision for a reliable 5 year housing supply demand. Being based on a premise of no building on greenbelt land the plan has failed to fully consider alternative sites such as North West Thundersley.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Firstly I must register my strong approval and support for Policy Had 2 within the Castle Point Plan. I agree with the premise of the plan which recognises the Hadleigh Farm area as being environmentally important; this is our heritage, and I believe that no changes should be made on these lands which would result in a significant impact on the landscape. I also agree with the principle that this Greenbelt site is not suitable for development. However, I do not believe that the overall current plan is consistent with national policy; it does not meet the Government's housing target, and thereby puts the Hadleigh Farmland site at high risk of speculative development proposals. Additionally, not all the potential sites in the area appear to have been considered; the site selection has ignored areas of mixed green and grey belt which could be utilised and therefore does not fully adhere to my understanding of the new NPPF guidelines. Further, this policy decision not to build on greenbelt land has resulted in a proposed overdevelopment of brownfield sites.	Add North West Thundersley site to the plan. This is a mix of green/grey belt land with the potential to provide 7500 houses. Doing this would relieve the pressure to build on already populated areas such as Canvey.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted.	
0864-0001	Individual	Carrie	Apps		Yes	HAD2	Yes	X	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	I object to the proposed allocation of the HAD2 site (Hadleigh Salvation Army Land and Green Belt) for housing development in the Castle Point Local Plan (Regulation 19 Draft, July 2025). My objection is based on the following grounds, with references to the relevant sections of the Plan: 1. Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt The Plan's own Green Belt policy (Section 17, pp. 126–130, Policy GB1, paragraphs 17.1–17.12) makes it clear that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate	With reference to the above sections and policies of the Castle Point Local Plan Regulation 19 Draft (July 2025), I respectfully request that the allocation of HAD2 be removed from the Plan. The Council should instead focus on delivering new homes through urban and brownfield regeneration, in line with its own stated strategy and the wishes of the local community. I'd like to suggest The Blinking Owl Site (GB8) as this would be less impacting to the landscape and heritage and	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to built development on site HAD2	Policy HAD2 does not propose housing to be built on this site.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											unless “very special circumstances” exist. No such circumstances have been demonstrated for HAD2 and the Green Belt . Allocating this site would undermine the fundamental purpose of the Green Belt, which is to prevent urban sprawl and protect the openness of the landscape. 2. Harm to Openness, Landscape, and Heritage HAD2 sits adjacent to Hadleigh Castle and Hadleigh Country Park—both of which are highly valued for their landscape, biodiversity, and heritage. Section 10 (Hadleigh, pp. 66–73, especially paragraphs 10.12–10.19) and Section 18 (Protecting our Biodiversity and Landscape, pp. 131–141, Policy BL1) of the Plan highlight the importance of these assets. Development here would cause irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the setting of these historic and natural features. 3. Infrastructure and Congestion Section 19 (Providing the Infrastructure Required to Support Growth, pp. 142–155, Policy INF1, paragraphs 19.1–19.14) acknowledges that Hadleigh already suffers from congestion and infrastructure constraints. Adding a large housing development at HAD2 would	has better access compared to Hadleigh.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											only make these problems worse, putting further strain on local roads, schools, and health services. 4. Failure to Prioritise Brownfield and Urban Sites The Plan’s spatial strategy (Section 6, pp. 19–30, Policy SP2, paragraphs 6.10–6.18) and housing policies (Section 13, pp. 85–93, paragraphs 13.1–13.8) both commit to an “urban-first, brownfield-led” approach. Allocating HAD2 directly contradicts this strategy, as there are still brownfield and urban sites available that would cause less harm and better align with the Plan’s objectives. 5. Community Opposition and Policy Conflict Section 5 (Vision & Objectives, pp. 17–18) and the Plan’s consultation summary reflect overwhelming community opposition to the loss of Green Belt land at HAD2. Proceeding with this allocation would undermine public trust and conflict with both local and national policy priorities.								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0865-0001	Individual	Harry	Wigley		Yes	HAD2	Yes		No	Effective, Justified	I am writing to object to the proposed allocation of the HAD2 site (Hadleigh Salvation Army Land) for housing development in the Castle Point Local Plan (Regulation 19 Draft, July 2025). My objection is based on the following grounds, with references to the relevant sections of the Plan: 1. Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt The Plan's own Green Belt policy (Section 17, pp. 126–130, Policy GB1, paragraphs 17.1–17.12) makes it clear that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless “very special circumstances” exist. No such circumstances have been demonstrated for HAD2. Allocating this site would undermine the fundamental purpose of the Green Belt, which is to prevent urban sprawl and protect the openness of the landscape. 2. Harm to Openness, Landscape, and Heritage HAD2 sits adjacent to Hadleigh Castle and Hadleigh Country Park—both of which are highly valued for their landscape, biodiversity, and heritage. Section 10 (Hadleigh, pp. 66–73, especially paragraphs 10.12–10.19) and Section 18 (Protecting	For these reasons, and with reference to the above sections and policies of the Castle Point Local Plan Regulation 19 Draft (July 2025), I respectfully request that the allocation of HAD2 be removed from the Plan. The Council should instead focus on delivering new homes through urban and brownfield regeneration, in line with its own stated strategy and the wishes of the local community. Once all localised developed areas are exhausted, The Blinking Owl Site formerly known as GB8 is the only viable option. Whilst it serves as nature land, it is not impacting to any landscapes, heritage and can act as a mini-town with it's own traffic routing. One large note to consider is that all other councils are needing to go through the same process. Hadleigh has only ONE road in and out that will need on the traffic of Southend Council's plans, unless you are willing to put childrens lives at risk by turning already over-used rat run roads that go past 2 primary schools (Church Road) into main roads.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to built development on site HAD2	Policy HAD2 does not propose housing to be built on this site.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											our Biodiversity and Landscape, pp. 131–141, Policy BL1) of the Plan highlight the importance of these assets. Development here would cause irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the setting of these historic and natural features. 3. Infrastructure and Congestion Section 19 (Providing the Infrastructure Required to Support Growth, pp. 142–155, Policy INF1, paragraphs 19.1–19.14) acknowledges that Hadleigh already suffers from congestion and infrastructure constraints. Adding a large housing development at HAD2 would only make these problems worse, putting further strain on local roads, schools, and health services. 4. Failure to Prioritise Brownfield and Urban Sites The Plan’s spatial strategy (Section 6, pp. 19–30, Policy SP2, paragraphs 6.10–6.18) and housing policies (Section 13, pp. 85–93, paragraphs 13.1–13.8) both commit to an “urban-first, brownfield-led” approach. Allocating HAD2 directly contradicts this strategy, as there are still brownfield and urban sites available that would cause less harm and better align with the Plan’s objectives.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											5. Community Opposition and Policy Conflict Section 5 (Vision & Objectives, pp. 17–18) and the Plan’s consultation summary reflect overwhelming community opposition to the loss of Green Belt land at HAD2. Proceeding with this allocation would undermine public trust and conflict with both local and national policy priorities.								
0 9 0 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ros aly nn	Pock lingt on		Yes	HA D2	No	Building on green belt is not legal therefore all housing or buildings planned on the Salvation Army farmland is not legal. It has also not considered local consultation fully.	No	Justified	There is no justification for building on green belt or changing the accepted use of agricultural land to building land. There are plenty of brown land sites to be used.	Use brown land sites only and provide adequately for schools , doctors and roads.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	B - see 090 8- 000 2.	No building on HAD2 Infrastructure	HAD2 is not proposd for built development Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0966-0001	Individual	Matthew	Engl and		Yes	HAD2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development,	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.													deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0967-0001	Individual	Kelly	Bullis		Yes	HAD2	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development,	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Housing Need The Council undertook a Local Housing Needs Assessment in December 2023 which identified a need for around 255 homes per year in Castle Point. Changes to the NPPF in December 2024, removed the ability for Councils to set a lower housing target, than that set out by the Standard Methodology. However, taking into account the extensive evidence base that has been prepared to support the Castle Point Plan, it is not considered appropriate, sustainable or in keeping with the NPPF when read as a whole, to	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.													deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. The Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft makes provision for around 364 new homes a year (around 6,196 homes to 2043) which is sufficient to meet the need for housing arising from the Local Housing Needs Assessment but is insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point,	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as the land is safeguarded by policy HAD6	
1 4 4 0 - 0 0 1 3	Organisati on	Joe sep h	Beal e	RSP B	Yes	Had 2	Yes		No	Not Stated	Policy Had2 – This Policy is welcome, but there needs to be a consideration for minimising recreational disturbance on priority/sensitive habitats. there is the opportunity to implement pollinator and Nightingale corridors, via scrub and flower-rich grassland.	This Policy is encouraging and there is much that is positive, but there needs to be Policy consideration for mitigating recreational disturbance on priority/sensitive habitats.	No				Policy Had2 – This Policy is welcome, but there needs to be a consideration for minimising recreational disturbance on priority/sensitive habitats. there is the opportunity to implement pollinator and Nightingale corridors, via scrub	Conserving and enhancing the network of priority habitats is covered by ENV3c. Th eplan policies need to be read as a whole.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	and flower-rich grassland. This Policy is encouraging and there is much that is positive, but there needs to be Policy consideration for mitigating recreational disturbance on priority/sensitive habitats.		
1 0 5 5 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Simon	Williams		Yes	HAD2	No	Leaves Castle Point vulnerable to government intervention. Should consider alternatives such as North West Thundersley (A130 corridor).	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I do however totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, and Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Supports HAD2 Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d							
											the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.														method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. Support for HAD2 Noted. A policy for the Green Lung in Hadleigh is not considered necessary as	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		the land is safeguarded by policy HAD3	
1 4 1 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Me gan	Ston e		Yes	Had 2	Not Sta ted	I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact	No t Sta ted		I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this farmland site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and	We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.	No				Support for policy HAD2 but concern that the plan for over 6000 homes puts this site at risk for speculative development	Support noted. Should the plan be adopted this will safeguard from speculative development.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								on the landscape or the Greenbelt.			use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction.								
1 4 1 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ber yl	Disn ey		Yes	Had 2	Not Sta ted	I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt.	No t Sta ted		I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction.	We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.	No				Support for policy HAD2 but concern that the plan for over 6000 homes puts this site at risk for speculative development	Support noted. Should the plan be adopted this will safeguard from speculative development.	N
1 4 1 4 -	Individual	Ala n	Disn ey		Yes	Had 2	Not Sta ted	I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature	No t Sta ted		I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for	We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure	No				Support for policy HAD2 but concern that the plan for over 6000 homes puts this site at risk	Support noted. Should the plan be	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt.			6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction.	asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.					for speculative development	adopted this will safeguard from speculative development.	
1 4 2 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Car li	Ban nan		Yes	Had 2	Not Sta ted	I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and	No t Sta ted			We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.					We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.	The Had2 Policy protects this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agrees with this direction, as this would personally impact me, hugely decreasing the value and view of my home that backs on to this historic site that was purchased with the understanding the land was strictly used for agricultural training, with the castle itself becoming a monument and restrictions involve protecting the land as Green Belt and preventing housing developments (like those once proposed on Salvation Army land), preserving views, wildlife, and archaeological potential.											
1002-0006	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	HAD2	No	The Regulation 19 consultation has not been undertaken properly, with two materially different versions of the Local Plan on the Council's website, and important documents added to the document library midway through the consultation period.	No	Positively prepared	5. 1 For the reasons described, we do not consider the draft Plan sound and do not support Policy Had2. We recognise that it broadly supports the provision of recreational, agricultural and training uses but it does not provide for much needed new homes at the site.	5.2 In addition, there is a typographic error or Part 2 of the Policy ('where they do not have a significant impact on the landscape [or] the Green belt], which we request is corrected. 5.3 Further, paragraph 10.20 of the supporting text says that 'it is therefore critical that any development allowed does not have an impact on the landscape'. Any scheme will have some level of impact on any landscape. This drafting should be revised to read 'any development allowed should not have a significant impact on the landscape'. That	Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		Broadly supports the premis of Policy HAD2 but does not support the lack of allowance for homes on this site. Highlights typo at paragraph 5.2 In addition, there is a typographic error or Part 2 of the Policy ('where they do not have a significant impact on the landscape [or] the Green belt], which we request is corrected.	This site has not been allocated for residential development due4 to a number of constraints including Green Belt allocation, Environmental , Historical aspect. More information on this can be found in the evidence base documents, specifically	10.2 It is therefor e critical that any develop ment allowed should not have a significant does not impact on the landsca pe. Further more, it is

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												would reflect the language used in the main body of the Policy.						the hadleigh heritage impact assessment and the housing capacity topic paper. See modifications to address typo highlighted.	important that any recreational or farming activities are compatible with the nature conservation status of the area.
0 8 2 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Keith	Broadhead		Yes	HAD2 (Policy Map)	No	Factualy incorrect. The cross-hatching representing the area and boundary of the farmland should coincide with the GREEN BELT boundary. This being the southern house fences of Castle Road, Park Chase, London Road [A 13] and western house fences of Tattersall Gardens.	No	Consistent with national policy	Drafting error requires correcting.	The cross-hatching representing the area and boundary of the Green Belt and farmland should coincide with the GREEN BELT boundary. This being the southern house fences of Castle Road, Park Chase, London Road [A 13] and western house fences of Tattersall Gardens.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	HAD2 policy area to coincide with Green Belt boundaries	The area covered by Had2 has been specifically chosen to encompass Hadleigh Country Park, Hadleigh Farm and Benfleet and Southend Marshes and is not intended to cover the extent of the Green Belt.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 3 1 0 - 0 0 0 4	Individual	Martin	Engl and		Yes	Had 3			No	Justified, consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over		Yes	As Hea d of the Sav e Had leig h Far mla nd Gro up I wou ld like to put the cas e for war d as to why our site is still at risk with a loc al pla n that will be fou nd uns	No	A	Remove the Had3 Hadleigh Clinic site from the local plan	Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. The Had3 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic and unwanted proposal for 14 homes. The Hadleigh Clinic is used by many local elderly residents from Hadleigh, who have no transport available, who walk to these clinics, and there will be no local alternative provided elsewhere nearby. The levels of health service provision must be maintained or improved with a local health hub but not removed. There is no justification to close this clinic, to re-provide the same service elsewhere in the Hadleigh area, and we have no local health hub. This local plan is just picking ludicrous sites to fulfil its urban brownfield only site selection policy, which unbelievably used AI for that site selection. With			ound, which will then lead to speculative development across our precious Greenbelt sites. Also, the over development with this plan will cause unt					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											reference to Policy Infra3, Improving Health and Wellbeing, paragraph 19.41 states, there are currently four community clinics in Castle Point, so with the Had3 & Thun3A policies these will be reduced by 50% and paragraph 19.42 states, there is currently a deficit in GP practice space in Castle Point. and as new residential development is permitted, new healthcare space is required, which contradicts the Had3 & Thun3A policies.			old issues to the local urban areas, when there are viable sites available which have not been seriously considered, like NW Thundersley. Also, as a					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														Committee Member for the Friends of Canvey Lake group I would like to put the case forward as to why our lake is still at risk with this plan that puts ove					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														r thre e tho usa nds hou ses on Can vey Isla nd, but whe n fou nd uns oun d, will lea d to spe cul ativ e dev elo pm ent acr oss our pre cio us Gre enb elt site s, with the					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														additional houses on our Grey Belt sites on Canvey, when there are viable sites available which have not been seriously considered, like NW Thundersley.					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0994-0003	Agent	Barry	Veater	Gov resource s Ltd OBO Barry Veater	Yes	HAD3	Yes		No	Justified	Policy Had3 assumes that the Council is receiving accurate information about the position of the clinic to be surplus to requirements. Criterion 1. of the policy says that the services operating from the facility can be provided elsewhere nearby. What would constitute 'nearby'?	The definition of 'nearby' in criterion 1. should be clearly defined. It would not be acceptable, for example, if the facilities provided at the clinic were relocated to Benfleet, making it difficult for those without transport to take advantage of the services provided.	No	Not Answered			what constitutes as nearby in relation to the location of the NHS facility	as detailed in the supporting text at paragraph 10.25 re-provision if required will be elsewhere in the Hadleigh area.	N
0361-0001	Individual	Annette	Roussou		Yes	Had3	No	I saw no consultation on the closing of the clinic. I know its popular for blood testing and being a local place, if one is ill, it is easier to go to rather than have to go to Southend Victoria.	Yes			Clinics should be made more use of for medical services: blood testing, hearing tests, urine testing collection etc				A	Objecting to HAD3 due to loss of NHS building	Policy HAD3 and Infra1 both safeguard the replacement of community facilities by ensuring that an alternative is provided and that the NHS building is surplus to requirement. Should the NHS decide that they need this building the proposed site would not be built upon.	N
0760-0001	Individual	James	Stephens		Yes	HAD3	Yes		No	Justified	I think the land is better used by the NHS than it would be with houses.	Remove this policy.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to HAD3 due to loss of NHS building	Policy HAD3 will only be supported if the NHS provides assurance that the site is surplus to their requirements and services	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		operating from the site can be provided elsewhere.	
0353-0005	Organisation	Hyacinth	Cables	NHS Property		Had 3		Both Hadleigh Clinic and Thundersley Clinic are currently owned by NHS Property Services (NHSPS). Under draft Policies Had 3 and Thun 3A, both sites are proposed as an allocation for the delivery of 14no. and 24no. new homes, respectively. In the delivery requirements of these allocations, NHSPS welcomes the wording which requires assurance from the NHS that each respective site is first identified as being surplus to local healthcare provision requirements. NHSPS welcome the allocations in-principle and would encourage the Council's continued engagement with NHSPS in assessing the suitability of allocations Had 3 and Thun 3A for redevelopment.								A	Both Hadleigh Clinic and Thundersley Clinic are currently owned by NHS Property Services (NHSPS). Under draft Policies Had 3 and Thun 3A, both sites are proposed as an allocation for the delivery of 14no. and 24no. new homes, respectively. In the delivery requirements of these allocations, NHSPS welcomes the wording which requires assurance from the NHS that each respective site is first identified as being surplus to local healthcare provision requirements. NHSPS welcome the allocations in-principle and would encourage the Council's continued engagement with NHSPS in assessing the suitability of allocations Had 3 and Thun 3A for redevelopment.	Support noted	N
090	Individual	Nicola	Carlson		Yes	HAD3	Yes		Yes			I do not believe it is justified to develop the Hadleigh Clinic site and replace with	No	Not Ans		A	Objecting to HAD3 due to loss of NHS building	Policy HAD3 and Infra1 both	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
3 - 0 0 0 2												14 homes. I don't understand how this is deemed surplus to requirements when it sometimes take 2/3 weeks to obtain an appointment. What is the alternative nearby provision as there is nowhere we can walk to and would have to drive to either Benfleet or Canvey which is not possible for many residents.		wer ed				safeguard the replacement of community facilities by ensuring that an alternative is provided and that the NHS building is surplus to requirement. Should the NHS decide that they need this building the proposed site would not be built upon.	
0 9 0 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pau l	Carl sen		Yes	HA D3	Yes		Ye s			I do not believe it is justified to develop the Hadleigh Clinic site and replace with 14 homes. I don't understand how this is deemed surplus to requirements when it sometimes take 2/3 weeks to obtain an appointment. What is the alternative nearby provision as there is nowhere we can walk to and would have to drive to either Benfleet or Canvey which is not possible for many residents.	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Objecting to HAD3 due to loss of NHS building	Policy HAD3 and Infra1 both safeguard the replacement of community facilities by ensuring that an alternative is provided and that the NHS building is surplus to requirement. Should the NHS decide that they need this building the proposed site would not be built upon.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1025-005	Individual	Martin	England		Yes	HAD3	No	The draft plan is not legally compliant as it fails to consider strategic alternatives, like North West Thundersley, which has been excluded, the Biodiversity and environmental protection needs strengthening, there is no credible five-year housing land supply and a lack of evidence on cross-boundary infrastructure with a duty to cooperate. The policy of not building on the Greenbelt is biased and predetermined.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites across the borough,	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Add the Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites of Kings Park HO31. Add the Greenbelt site of Land East of Manor Trading S0145 SHLAA 2018. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Benfleet at 347, Thundersley at 643, and Hadleigh at 305, keeping Existing Commitments 480, and Windfall Allowance 675. Total housing target of 11,000 Remove the Had3 Hadleigh Clinic site from the local plan	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Objecting to HAD3 due to loss of NHS building	Policy HAD3 and Infra1 both safeguard the replacement of community facilities by ensuring that an alternative is provided and that the NHS building is surplus to requirement. Should the NHS decide that they need this building the proposed site would not be built upon.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. The Had3 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic and unwanted proposal for 14 homes. The Hadleigh Clinic is used by many local elderly residents from Hadleigh, who have no transport available, who walk to these clinics, and there will be no local alternative provided elsewhere nearby. The levels of health service provision must be maintained or improved with a local health hub but not removed. There is no justification to close this clinic, to re-provided the same service elsewhere in the Hadleigh area, and we have no local health hub. This local plan is just picking ludicrous sites to fulfill its urban brownfield only site selection policy, which unbelievably used AI for that site selection. With reference to Policy Infra3, Improving Health and Wellbeing, paragraph 19.41 states, there are currently four community clinics in Castle Point, so with the Had3 & Thun3A policies these will be reduced by								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											50% and paragraph 19.42 states, there is currently a deficit in GP practice space in Castle Point. and as new residential development is permitted, new healthcare space is required, which contradicts the Had3 & Thun3A policies.								
1 0 3 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Nick	Turner		Yes	HAD3	Yes		Yes		Consistent, could be even more joined-up by more closely defining acceptable alternative premises; and related parameters.	Paras 10.24 and 10.25 are logical as far as they go; but could be more vigorously pursued to achieve greater savings and a more harmonious visual landscape. The proposal has clear merits, and these could be expanded by incorporating a complete redesign of the area to include Broom House and the Bus Garage. The definition of the replacement health facility in Hadleigh, should include ground floor unimpeded access, suitable for pushchairs, wheelchairs and people of all ages with a bus stop on a main route nearby. The current Clinic is an admirable focus of health resources for Hadleigh, very close to a bus stop and with easy access.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Expand the site to include Broom House and the Bus Garage Specify that any new facility should have accessible access honour the historic aspect of the existing health facility	The site HAD3 is currently available for development, other sites in the vicinity are not available for development. The site will be masterplanned with regard to the Design policies within the Castle Point Plan including accessible design	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												It is also an historic asset with a plaque from its opening ceremony; the replacement facility should therefore incorporate a name signifying its history, and have a blue or purple plaque to commemorate the original act of creating the Hadleigh Clinic as an important Health Centre.							
1 0 6 5 - 0 0 0 2	Not Answered	Ter ry	Clar ke		Not Answ ered	HA D3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over development of urban sites policy across the borough,	Add North West Thundersley site, reduce the urban housing target by half, remove the Had3 Hadleigh Clinic site from the local plan	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Objecting to HAD3 because: Accessible clinic should not be removed	Policy HAD3 required the NHS to provide assurance that the site is surplus to requirements and that the services can be provided elsewhere nearby.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. The Had3 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic and unwanted proposal for 14 homes. The Hadleigh Clinic is used by many local elderly residents from Hadleigh, who have no transport available, who walk to these clinics, and there will be no local alternative provided elsewhere nearby. The levels of health service provision must be maintained or improved with a local health hub but not removed. There is no justification to close this clinic, to re-provided the same service elsewhere in the Hadleigh area, and we have no local health hub. This local plan is just picking ludicrous sites to fulfill its urban brownfield only site selection policy, which unbelievably used AI for that site selection. With reference to the Infra3 Policy, Improving Health and									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											Wellbeing, paragraph 19.41 states, there are currently four community clinics in Castle Point, so with the Had3 & Thun3A policies these will be reduced by 50% and paragraph 19.42 states, there is currently a deficit in GP practice space in Castle Point. and as new residential development is permitted, new healthcare space is required, which contradicts the Had3 & Thun3A policies.								
1 0 6 6 - 0 0 0 2	Not Answered	She ila	Clar ke		Not Answ ered	HA D3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government	Add North West Thundersley site, reduce the urban housing target by half, remove the Had3 Hadleigh Clinic site from the local plan.	No	Not Ans wer ed			Objecting to HAD3 because: Accessible clinic should not be removed	Policy HAD3 required the NHS to provide assurance that the site is surplus to requirements and that the services can be provided elsewhere nearby.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											intervention. The plan is based on the total over development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. The Had3 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic and unwanted proposal for 14 homes. The Hadleigh Clinic is used by many local elderly residents from Hadleigh, who have no transport available, who walk to these clinics, and there will be no local alternative provided elsewhere nearby. The levels of health service provision must be maintained or improved with a local health hub but not removed. There is no justification to close this clinic, to re-provided the same service elsewhere in the Hadleigh area, and we have no local health hub. This local plan is just picking ludicrous sites to fulfill its urban brownfield only site selection policy, which									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											unbelievably used AI for that site selection. With reference to the Infra3 Policy, Improving Health and Wellbeing, paragraph 19.41 states, there are currently four community clinics in Castle Point, so with the Had3 & Thun3A policies these will be reduced by 50% and paragraph 19.42 states, there is currently a deficit in GP practice space in Castle Point. and as new residential development is permitted, new healthcare space is required, which contradicts the Had3 & Thun3A policies.								
1092-0004	Not Answered	Una	Kipps		Not Answered	HAD3	Yes		No	Effective	I see nothing to indicate that there is any realistic proposal on the table for provision of alternative clinic facilities. In the plan for Hadleigh town centre which we worked on with CPBC ten years ago, there was provision for both the Library and a clinic in a new community hub in the centre of the island-site, which could have worked well. But the only recent additional NHS facility in Hadleigh is in the ground floor of a new-build right on the single-carriageway A13 (near Meadow Rd) where there is no layby for a taxi to pull over to unload a wheelchair user, and no appropriate parking nearby. All these authorities need to get real about the ageing population they serve (just		No	Not Answered			Objects to HAD3 due to loss of NHS facility and lack of plan to replace	Policy HAD3 specifically states that the site will only come forward once reassurance has been provided from the NHS that the building is surplus to requirements and that the services provided currently can be provided elsewhere.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											count the quantity of sheltered housing & nursing homes already in the area) and bring these schemes together as clear jointly-agreed proposals before committing to building additional homes on sites currently serving the community.								
0 0 3 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ste phe n	McQ uilla n		Yes	Had 4	Not Sta ted	Dear Castle Point Plan, I wish to object to the building of 114 homes at Had4 Land of Scrub Lane. This land, owned by Essex council, was to be developed as a new school. There is only one infants and primary school in Hadleigh, these schools are situated next to this area.	No t Sta ted	Not Stated		Considering the amount of homes planned in Hadleigh, 402, and the possibility of more new homes in the future, it would make more sense to build a new school on this site, where it could share the adjacent playing field. I understand the need for more homes but school places in close vicinity, walking distance, of these homes is crucial, especially as the “Plan” is to discourage the use of cars.	Not Sta ted		No		Objects to the building of 114 homes at Had4 Land of Scrub Lane. This land, owned by Essex council, was to be developed as a new school. There is only one infants and primary school in Hadleigh, these schools are situated next to this area. Considering the amount of homes planned in Hadleigh, 402, and the possibility of more new homes in the future, it would make more sense to build a new school on this site, where it could share the adjacent playing field. I understand the need for more homes but school places in close vicinity, walking distance, of these homes is crucial,	Comments noted. Current education needs have benn infoirmed by the Infratstucture Delivery Plan (IDP) and in liaison with the Education Authority at Essex County Council.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																	especially as the “Plan” is to discourage the use of cars.		
0 0 7 5 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Oli ve	Cam pe		Not State d	Had 4	Not Sta ted	Dear Castle Point Council I object to the planned housing in this plan, it's a nightmare driving past the said area due to parked cars even when the school is closed. At times the traffic is stationary trying to get through, a special danger for emergency services.	No t Sta ted	Not stated	It's just too many houses etc, even if sizes of boxes it still means more cars per house to park, two space allocation per property is not enough.	I'm sure that great open space would benefit the attached school so much more, give the local children an open space to actually run and play instead of taking spaces/views away. How the local people will appreciate you then. Give something back instead of taking.	Not Sta ted		No		I object to the planned housing in this plan, it's a nightmare driving past the said area due to parked cars even when the school is closed. At times the traffic is stationary trying to get through, a special danger for emergency services. It's just too many houses etc, even if sizes of boxes it still means more cars per house to park, two space allocation per property is not enough. I'm sure that great open space would benefit the attached school so much more, give the local children an open space to actually run and play instead of taking spaces/views away.	Comments noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0170001	Individual	John	Spurgeon		Not Stated	Had 4	Not Stated	I'm sending you this email in response to a leaflet that was put through my door last week. We have concerns over the amount of housing that is proposed in the above reference. In the last proposal we received it suggested in the region of 65 homes, and now it 114! One of our concerns will be the parking on the road, considering the development of Scrub Mews which allows parking in Scrub Lane despite them having off road parking, this causes many problems with traffic, and is dangerous to traffic coming out of Bilton Road! If this is allowed for this development it will be dangerous, as this road is already used as a pick up for the school morning and afternoon!	Not Stated	Not Stated	Our other concern is Scrub lane is only a small road and can't cope with the traffic and parking at this present time, so considering there could be another 200 plus cars from this development and also the infrastructure for schools and doctors in high demand, how is all this going to be met!	A more reasonable amount of property's should be suggested as this is excessive! As we have lived in Scrub Lane for over [REDACTED] since it was an unmade Lane, I'm not opposed to development, but this will spoil the area by making it over developed!	No		No		Concerns over the amount of housing that is proposed. Concerns with parking on the road, considering the development of Scrub Mews which allows parking in Scrub Lane despite them having off road parking, this causes many problems with traffic, and is dangerous to traffic coming out of Bilton Road! If this is allowed for this development it will be dangerous, as this road is already used as a pick up for the school morning and afternoon!. Further concern is Scrub lane is only a small road and can't cope with the traffic and parking at this present time, so considering there could be another 200 plus cars from this development and also the infrastructure for schools and doctors in high demand, how is all this going to be met!.	Parking provision covered under Policy T7 . Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0263-	Individual	David	Mahoney		Not Stated	Had 4	Not Stated	Good morning I would like to object to building on Had4 in scrub lane.	Not Stated	Not Stated			Not Stated	Not Stated	No		Objects to building on Had4 in scrub lane.	Objection noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 1																			
0 2 6 5 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ric har d	Bate s		Not State d	Had 4	Not Sta ted	Hi there, Hope you're keeping well! I am getting in touch to make a request if possible please? I would like to be informed of any previous applications to build on the Land South of Scrub Lane which is next to Hadleigh Infants and Nursery School. I am a local resident who wants to gain a full understanding as to what these applications entailed (use, number of properties etc.) and why they were eventually rejected. Please feel free to send over any previous documentation relating to these proposals. Have a nice weekend and thanks in advance for your cooperation	No t Sta ted				Not Sta ted	Not Stat ed	No		Wishes to be notified about planning applications on Land South of Scrub Lane.	Planing applications are advertised locally in accordance with national regulations and can be checked on the Council's website here https://www.castlepoint.gov.uk/find-planning-applications/	N
1 0 1 3 - 0 0 0 7	Organisati on	Tes sa	Sau nder s	Angl ian Wat er Serv ices Ltd	Yes	HA D4	Yes		Ye s		NOTE Consistency issue: Anglian Water recognises there are a number of redevelopment and regeneration opportunities within the town, at various sites. This site allocation policy includes the requirement that "the development proposal is compliant with all other relevant policies of this Plan"; however, none of the other site allocations for Hadleigh include this requirement. We question whether all allocation policies require this criterion to ensure that the plan is	Consistency issue between Hadleigh site allocation policies in relation as to whether a surface water drainage strategy should be required or a clause requiring "development proposals to be compliant with all other relevant policies of this Plan".	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Consistency issue: Anglian Water recognises there are a number of redevelopment and regeneration opportunities within the town, at various sites. This site allocation policy includes the requirement that "the development proposal is compliant with all other relevant policies of this Plan"; however,	Agreed in Anglian Water SoCG as unnecessary and inconsistent with other policies. NPPF paragraph 16 states that Plans should avoid unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area.	Y Policy Had4 Remove sentence 'The proposal is compliant with all other relevant policies of this Plan' Note This is

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											read as a whole, or whether specific policy requirements such as the submission of a surface water drainage strategy (in accordance with Policy SD3) is required. Whilst surface water flood risk is not identified in the supporting text the SFRA Level 2 recommendation suggests all proposed development sites would need to demonstrate that surface water run-off is managed and discharged in accordance with the drainage hierarchy.						none of the other site allocations for Hadleigh include this requirement. We question whether all allocation policies require this criterion to ensure that the plan is read as a whole, or whether specific policy requirements such as the submission of a surface water drainage strategy (in accordance with Policy SD3) is required. Whilst surface water flood risk is not identified in the supporting text the SFRA Level 2 recommendation suggests all proposed development sites would need to demonstrate that surface water run-off is managed and discharged in accordance with the drainage hierarchy.	Policies should not be read in isolation, and the Castle Point Plan is to be read as a whole. Modification to Policy Had4 Remove sentence 'The proposal is compliant with all other relevant policies of this Plan' Note This is done for consistency between policies	done for consistency between policies.
0 2 7 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Lyn ett e	Darc an		Not State d	Had 4	Not Sta ted	I am writing to formally register my strong objection to the proposed development of 114 houses on the above-mentioned land. I cannot understand how 114 houses can realistically fit within such a small space. This level of density would result in a minimum of 228 additional	No t Sta ted		Driving along Scrub Lane has become increasingly difficult, with parked cars, sleeping policemen, and congestion making travel slow and stressful. Many residents are forced to park outside garages in Seymour Road, across driveways, and even on green areas due to lack of available parking.	A much smaller number, in keeping with the character and infrastructure capacity of the area, would be far more appropriate. I urge the council to reject this application in its current form and to give proper consideration to the very real concerns of local people who	Not Sta ted		No	B - see 027 3- 002	Objects to proposed housing on HAD4 Land South of Scrub Lane	Comments noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								vehicles on the roads, most likely far more as families grow and children become drivers. The land simply cannot accommodate the necessary car parking spaces. Inevitably, the overspill will spread onto surrounding roads, worsening the existing congestion and further reducing air quality for current residents. We have already seen the impact of a smaller development in recent years. That change alone has created serious parking and traffic issues along Scrub Lane. Residents of those new houses now park on the road, restricting traffic flow and causing frequent jams.			Traffic in this area is already unsustainable. During rush hour (from 7:00am until around 9:30am), at school drop-off times, or when there are any accidents or roadworks in the surrounding area, Scrub Lane is gridlocked. This situation will only deteriorate with an influx of at least 500 new residents. Healthcare provision is another major concern. Residents already struggle to secure doctors' appointments, yet this development would place hundreds more people onto already overstretched registers. Whilst I acknowledge the need for additional housing, the proposed figure of 114 houses is wholly disproportionate for this location and shows little consideration for existing residents.	will be directly and adversely affected.							
0273-0002	Individual	Lynette	Darc an		Not Stated	Had 4	Not Stated		Not Stated		Please give a thought to the residents and those that use these roads regularly. There is insufficient parking to accommodate 114 homes as I stated earlier. In fact, if the plot was used solely for parking it would not be able to accommodate 114+ cars! Where are the residents of those 114 dwellings going to park? What about their visitors? What about the health professionals? Where are the parents going to park to drop off their children to Hadleigh Infant		Not Stated		No	None	Objects to HAD4 because: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Infrastructure	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											School? During busy times or if there is any accidents in the area, Scrub Lane and surrounding roads are gridlocked which does not require the hinderance of another 114+ cars being parked permanently in the area. Those that live here are already parking in front of the garages of Seymour Road to help the flow of traffic in the area. I can see this becoming a huge problem. Are residents expected to park on grass verges? Or struggle to park somewhere in the surrounding area? Or do you intend to create a one way parking or one way streets. Do you want us to become like Westcliffe where it is impossible to park and move around? Also, the traffic system in the area will need to be changed. In can take up to 15 mins during busy times to get out of Scrub Lane and a further 15 mins to get out at the lights by Morrisons. Creating lots of traffic fumes that local residents have to deal with. This is not right. Also, it is almost impossible to get a doctors appointment, how are residents going to fare getting the medical help they need with another 114 (at least) people which are likely to require more than the usual care provided?								comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02820020	Organisation	Kevin	Frasier	Essex County Council	Yes	Had 4	Not Stated		No	Effective	ECC notes the policy states that proposals must comply with all other relevant policies in the Plan. However, ECC recommended that developments are required to demonstrate the delivery of multifunctional GBI and biodiversity net gain to ensure their integration into development design and delivery.	ECC require an additional Criteria to read: Opportunities for providing multifunctional green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Recommends adding an additional criteria that developments required to demonstrate delivery of multifunctional GI and BNG	Accepted and additional criteria added to policy to require developments to demonstrate the delivery of multifunctional GI and BNG	Provides opportunities for multifunctional green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain
03040001	Individual	Linda	Godman		Not Stated	Had 4	Not Stated	I strongly object to the proposed development to build 114 homes on the field in Scrub lane. The road is already regularly congested and the planned buildings will not be in keeping with the other houses. Also the doctors surgery is at full capacity	Not Stated				Not Stated		No		I strongly object to the proposed development to build 114 homes on the field in Scrub lane. The road is already regularly congested and the planned buildings will not be in keeping with the other houses. Also the doctors surgery is at full capacity	Concerns noted. Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, assessing impacts and recommending interventions.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0310003	Individual	Martin	England		Yes	Had 4	No		No	Justified, consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over		Yes	As Head of the Save Hadleigh Farmland Group I would like to put the case forward as to why our site is still at risk with a local plan that will be found unsound	No	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by		N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. The Had4 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic proposal for 114 homes, using the Castle Point Density and Capacity Study, and a 100dph urban guide, in a residential area of housing currently having homes at 20dph. Housing on this site at 100dph would equate to six blocks of flats, four flats per floor, and four stories high, which is out of character for the area. The statement that the frontage of the development is designed to reflect the character of Scrub Lane, is a complete fabrication, as the houses opposite relates to approx. 15dph and it will never match the current street scene. The addition of 114 homes, and over 200 cars, would cause major issues at the Scrub Lane /			ound, which will then lead to speculative development across our precious Greenbelt sites. Also, the over development with this plan will cause unt					the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											Rectory Rod traffic lights. This resident led local plan said protect the Greenbelt and use the Brownfield sites, but the resident's responses did not say to destroy those areas like Scrub Lane with over development. This policy is the perfect reason why you need to add the North West Thundersley site as an alternative site, that gives us the housing numbers required, driven by an infrastructure first policy and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites across the borough.			old issu es to the loc al urb an are as, whe n ther e are viab le site s avai labl e whi ch hav e not bee n seri ousl y con side red, like NW Thu nde rsle y. Als o, as a					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														Co mm itte e Me mb er for the Frie nds of Can vey Lak e gro up I wou ld like to put the cas e for war d as to why our lake is still at risk with this pla n that put s ove					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														r thre e tho usa nds hou ses on Can vey Isla nd, but whe n fou nd uns oun d, will lea d to spe cul ativ e dev elo pm ent acr oss our pre cio us Gre enb elt site s, with the					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														additional houses on our Grey Belt sites on Canvey, when there are viable sites available which have not been seriously considered, like NW Thundersley.					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0311-0001	Individual	Hannah	Cox		Not Stated	Had 4	No	I object to the building of new homes in relation to the about policy reference The Had4 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic proposal for 114 homes, using the Castle Point Density and Capacity Study, and a 100dph urban guide, in a residential area of housing currently having homes at 20dph. Housing on this site at 100dph would equate to six blocks of flats, four flats per floor, and four stories high, which is out of character for the area.	Not Stated	Not Stated	The statement that the frontage of the development is designed to reflect the character of Scrub Lane, is a complete fabrication, as the houses opposite relates to approx. 15dph and it will never match the current street scene. The addition of 114 homes, and over 200 cars, would cause major issues at the Scrub Lane / Rectory Road traffic lights. The addition of 114 homes would add over 300 people to the Hollies surgery. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage in these urban areas. Residents said use the Brownfield sites, but not to destroy those areas like Scrub Lane with over development. It also says the loss of playing field land is mitigated by an appropriate financial contribution towards new or enhanced playing field facilities nearby, so does this include the school field.		Not Stated	No			Policy Had4 Policy: Objects as it is over development urban policy, with an unrealistic proposal for 114 homes, using the Castle Point Density and Capacity Study, and a 100dph urban guide, in a residential area of housing currently having homes at 20dph. Housing on this site at 100dph would equate to six blocks of flats, four flats per floor, and four stories high, which is out of character for the area. Disagrees that it can be designed to reflect the adjacent character of Scrub Lane.	Noted	N
0312-0001	Individual	Jill	Walsh		Yes	Had 4	No	Dear Sir/Madam I do not support the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft Consultation. It is not legally compliant as it fails to meet the Governments housing target for Castle Point. The site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines.	No	Justified, consistent with national policy	I do not believe this to be an effective, sound or justified policy. Housing density, with a suggested proposal of 114 homes, would be totally out of keeping with the surrounding area. Scrub Lane consists, for the main part, of detached houses with a housing density of 15 dph, totally at odds with the proposed 100dhp. Scrub	I believe it is imperative that this plan must introduce the controlled release of some Green Belt on the main land to reduce significantly the number of houses presently being considered for Canvey Island.	Not Stated		No		Policy Had4 Policy: Objects on over-development, highways, local character. Cites mature oak trtrees on site.	Had4: Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											Lane is a busy road, especially during rush hour and school run times. The proposed development could potentially add a further 228 motor vehicles entering/exiting the site, leading to and adding to the traffic chaos that occurs every day during the peak times. Scrub Lane is also a well known rat run for vehicles to avoid the High Street. The junction of Scrub Lane/Rectory Road/New Road is traffic light controlled , with normally about six cars exiting Scrub Lane before the lights are against them - queues at peak times often extend back over 200 yards - further traffic will only compound the problem. 10.29 'Pedestrian, cycling and public transport measures connecting to the town centre, nearby facilities and services and Hadleigh Infants and Nursery School will be required. Main vehicular access will be from Scrub Lane.' Public transport measures connecting to town centre ...will not be required and are not viable. The Lane has numerous speed bumps and is not suitable or wide enough to permit the use of buses. The town centre itself is a matter of a five minute walk away. There are a number of mature oak trees on the site, which								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											absorb harmful carbon dioxide to fight climate change, cool the planet by providing shade, prevent soil erosion and flooding with their roots. Together with a long stretch of hedgerow this area provides a home to a large variety of birds and families of foxes (at least two distinct families, each having produced two cubs this year). Nature needs protecting, not having their habitat destroyed. There is only one GP practice in Hadleigh which is already struggling to provide appointments for patients. A further potential 228 patients (estimated at a minimum of 2 people per dwelling) would be unsustainable for the practice. This proposal is quite clearly overdevelopment, with a lack of accompanying infrastructure and places enormous pressure on local drainage and sewage.								
0318-0001	Individual	Chris	Port			Had 4	Not Stated	Hello, I tried to sign and comment on the above sites application /plan but when on website i simply received 'error code 404'I which may or may not have been intentional and was unable to complete the form. The idea of 114 new homes in such a small area is without doubt not in keeping with the immediate area and will simply be an eyesore no matter how high	Not Stated	Not Stated						A	Objects to Scrub Lane site. Overdevelopment, impacts on highways and education infrastructure.	<u>Infrastructure</u> Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). <u>Highways Impacts</u> The plan has been subject	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								the development has to be built . The council are already struggling with finances and so keeping in mind a certain percent of this development will go to unemployed families....it will add to the weight of financial problems the council has. The council has said on many occasions that it is struggling so is this true or not . The homes will attract 1.8 cars per household which means a further 200 cars will hit the immediate area which will cause many traffic problems which will over flow into nearby neighbour hoods . The schools are already over subscribed and the new homes which will house 800 new people 200 of which will be children of school age will well over burden the schools capacity AND will push locals out...locals who have contributed to the area them selves via council tax over the years. The whole idea of this amount of homes is ridiculas ,a third of this amount would suffice and part of the area must be kept as recreational for obvious reasons. thanks,Mr Chris Port ,local resident .										to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0994-0004	Agent	Barry	Veater	Gov resources Ltd OBO Barry Veater	Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Consistent with national policy	It is unreasonable for children from an infants school to be expected to travel to enhanced playing field facilities elsewhere. A reduction in the site area should be considered to retain sufficient space for children at the school. In addition, parking provision for 114 new homes on the site would create further parking problems on Scrub Lane particularly at the start and end of the school day. The number of homes should be reduced to a single line fronting Scrub Lane.	The depth of the site should be reduced to retain sufficient playing field space for the school and to ensure sufficient space can be provided for residents cars to ensure there is no further spillage of parked cars on to Scrub Lane.	No	Not Answered			Objecting to HAD4: reduce the size of the site to provide extra field provision to the school Parking capacity on scrub lane Development should be one single line	The NPPF at chapter 11 states tghat policies should promote an effective use of land, therefore by	N
0348-0001	Individual	Debbie	Collins			Had 4	Not Stated	My objections is the volume of the numbers homes and the number of habitable rooms on this site. Traffic in Scrub Lane is already conjested during school pick up and drop off times. The development will increase traffic volume generally in the road. How will the current school be able to accommodate the additional number of children?	Not Stated							Policy Had 4. Objects to proposed development numver of habitable rooms. Will cause traffic congestion. Concern over availability of school places.	Infrastructure: Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Highways Impacts: The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommendin	N	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		g interventions.	
0 2 7 5 - 0 0 0 2	Organisati on	Joe	May	Leigh on-Sea Town Council	Not State d	Had 4	Not Sta ted	We have also considered the allocation HAD4 for 114 homes. Leigh-on-Sea Town Council consider that such a development could have a serious knock on effect to Leigh-on-Sea particularly the Highlands Boulevard area through the town to the Station where the temptation for commuters from the development to use Leigh station will create a detrimental effect on the road system and parking in the area which is already under stress.	No t Sta ted				Not Sta ted		No	B - see 027 5 - 000 3	<u>Policy HAD4</u> We have also considered the allocation HAD4 for 114 homes. Leigh-on-Sea Town Council consider that such a development could have a serious knock on effect to Leigh-on-Sea particularly the Highlands Boulevard area through the town to the Station where the temptation for commuters from the development to use Leigh station will create a detrimental effect on the road system and parking in the area which is already under stress.	Comments noted.	N
0 6 6 7 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	James	Cape well		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Justified	114 dwellings is not in keeping with the existing character of Scrub Lane. The existing character is single or double story detached dwellings. Scrub Lane can't cope with more cars / traffic 'Complex needs' could be an issue being near a school 'Complex needs' could be an		No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Location of site close to a school and play park	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											issue being near a park As an example the Mews development has itself caused a bottleneck so 114 extra cars will have to be accommodated on the land too. The number of dwellings proposed is substantially higher and on a smaller block of land than any previous rejected local plan.								highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Location The council has a duty to provide homes for all and supported living	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		dwelling are considered appropriate in this location. More information can be found in the Equality Impact Assessment.	
0671-0001	Individual	Melanie	Berry		Yes	HAD4	No	Cannot see sustainability appraisal and habitat regs assessment	No	Positively prepared	Hard to assess soundness without seeing the proposed building plan. Discrepancy over number of dwellings - is it 80 as stated here or 114 as an alternative version shows? If 114 is the correct figure then I cannot see how this is possible in the space. If 80 dwellings is correct then I assume that this includes flats, which would be out-of-keeping with the rest of Scrub Lane and inappropriate next to infant/nursery school and school playing fields. We need to see the planned development to ensure it fits with the local environment. 80 dwellings means 80-160+ car parking spaces - are these in the plans? Most family homes now have at least 2 cars/vans - more now that young adults are living in parental home for longer. What is being done to expand other services - eg Hollies surgery which struggles already with capacity. What parking will	Require details of the planned development, impact on local infrastructure and how negative impact will be mitigated. What is actual number of dwellings permitted and how will this be achieved whilst complying with national policies.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Questioning HAD4 allocation number 80 or 114 Request to see plans Objecting to HAD4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character	Allocation numbers Policy Had4 allocates atleast 114 homes. Plans Request Plans have not been submitted to the Council on this site but please be advised that should the Council receive an application for this site plans will be available to view on the Councils website. Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											be provided for Hadleigh Infants as parents currently use Scrub Lane - will this parking be kept? How will increased traffic at junction of Scrub Lane/Rectory Road/New Road be dealt with - already overloaded during rush hours and used as ‘rat run’ when problems on A13/A127. Currently this land is a wasted space so I agree that it is a prime space for building but it needs to be a sensible amount of dwellings to fit in with the area and 80/114 (whichever is correct figure) both seem outlandish. Residents need to see more detailed plans before we are able to agree whether sound or legally compliant.								to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0672-0001	Individual	STEVE	BERRY		Yes	HAD4	Yes	I've put 'yes' because I am assuming the team who have produced this draft are professional enough and better qualified than myself to know what 'legal compliance' means in relation to providing this document	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Loading another 80 homes (yes the draft shown in the link above is the incorrect 2023 one I am led to believe!!) let alone 114 as the new 2026 draft apparently shows plus a car space for each dwelling suggests this proposed development would have to be multi-storey or even include a large number of HMOs, because the plot size is not large enough for 80 (or 114) dwellings. This would not be in keeping with the style of the existing properties along Scrub Lane. If there are more cars than dwellings then it is likely that Scrub Lane will develop into an obstructive car-park for most hours of the day. Already at school drop-off and pick-up times there is a large bottle-neck alongside this plot. Whilst on the subject of traffic, this road is already jam-packed during the rush-hours and is used as a rat-run whenever traffic is impacted along the A13 and A127 routes. Regular gridlocks occur which would be well-known to those who live in the area, which I very much doubt anyone proposing Had4 currently does. So, from the effective aspect of 'soundness' (what a ridiculous way of assessing the impact on residents, by the way!) it depends whose viewpoint you are looking from. From my own this	Less homes on this plot. Consideration given to traffic problems that will arise from loading so many dwellings alongside an already busy road. I haven't got time to reword the Had4 except to change the number of dwellings to 20. The dwellings should have gardens and off-road parking spaces just like the existing properties in Scrub Lane.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Location of site close to a school and play park	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											'effectively' messes up my ability to drive about the area and 'effectively' proposes far greater traffic problems at some point in the future. Is it 'justified'? Again, a planning officer will have his target to achieve with pressure from above to squeeze as many dwellings into as small a space as possible. From my perspective, as a resident, I understand homes will be built on this plot but I believe it is totally unjustifiable to suggest this many properties in such a small space. It would not be comparable to the existing volume of dwellings anywhere in Scrub Lane. Indeed, as an example of how The Planning Team messed things up in the past by allowing too many homes to be built without sufficient parking see Scrub Lane Mews for information then try driving past it unhindered at any time of the day! 80 (or 114!?) dwellings with a car each (at least)....you really are not being serious, surely! Another reason it cannot be justified is that the local doctors surgery, The Hollies, in Rectory Road is already overrun with patients and securing a quick appointment is already very difficult. Positively prepared? Well, it's not a positive from my perspective, in any way													the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Location The council has a duty to provide homes for all and supported living dwellings are considered appropriate in this location. More information can be found in the Equality Impact Assessment.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											shape or form. Positive would be helping the community with this space.....a few houses, a new doctor's surgery, a pub, a play area for kids after they come out of school...no, you as Planners have a mandate from the government to swamp us all with houses wherever they can be squeezed on to the Castle Point map, sadly. What is wrong here is that there are not enough Planners who make these decisions living here to care what happens to our community. Consistent with National Policy? Well, the Government wants homes to house the burgeoning population so that box would be ticked by this policy. But does it not have a policy of safeguarding children so I would need to know what the 6 dwellings housing individuals with 'complex needs' could involve in this respect. With the proposed development overlooking an infant school playground hopefully there will be due consideration given to who is housed in such a sensitive area.									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0714-0001	Individual	Nicola	Kearney		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Effective	I formally object to the planning application for the proposed development of 114 homes on Scrub Lane, Hadleigh. I have reviewed the plans and have serious concerns regarding the impact this development will have on our community, particularly in relation to highway safety and safeguarding. I do not believe the draft plan document to be sound. Our road already suffers from significant parking and traffic issues, particularly during peak times such as school drop-off and pick-up. The lack of available parking spaces leads to vehicles obstructing pavements daily, creating a hazard for pedestrians, long queues of vehicles along the road in both directions as there are already issues at the Scrub lane Mews junction, and only one lane can be accessed at both these points, which also hinder crucial access for emergency vehicles. The addition of 114 new homes will generate a significant increase in vehicle movements and a demand for parking that cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure. The proposed provision is, in my opinion, inadequate and will exacerbate the current	Revise the number of homes built on this land, and review the assisted living homes plan for safeguarding.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Location of site close to a school	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											situation to an unmanageable and dangerous level. I have a significant concern about the proposed six assisted living homes, which are to be located directly adjacent to Hadleigh Junior School. While I fully support the provision of assisted living, having a child on the spectrum, you have not made clear the nature of this housing, and close proximity of these homes backing on to to a junior school raises serious safeguarding questions that must be addressed. The well-being and safety of the children at Hadleigh Junior School must be a top priority for the council. I am not convinced that this is a suitable location for this type of housing, and I urge the council to consider the potential risks and to put the safeguarding of children first in its decision-making process.													the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Location The council has a duty to provide homes for all and supported living dwellings are considered appropriate in this location. More information can be found in the Equality Impact Assessment.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 7 3 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Rac hae l	Wra tisl aw		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Positively prepared	There is not room on this plot of land to build 114 homes unless they are very small homes with little to no gardens and no parking. People need private outdoor space which by fitting 114 homes on this plot would not achieve. 114 homes would mean a lot more children needing school places, where will these school places come from? 114 new homes means a lot more traffic on Scrub Lane which is already a busy road for a residential street making it even more dangerous for families to live on. I am petrified of walking down the road with my young children when it gets busy that one of them will suddenly run into the road. There is a speed bump missing halfway along and cars speed up between these bumps. Parking for parents will become very difficult if this stretch of road is taken up by new housing making the area very busy and more dangerous for children and parents at drop off and pick up time. Additionally the impact of air quality from increased traffic using Scrub Lane will be bad for current and future residents.	Move the junior school to this site instead and build new housing on that site. Or if there must be new housing carried out here then limit it to no more than 30 new homes.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Loss of habitat to animals Disruption to students education	Traffic Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Loss of Habitat Any application for homes on this site will have	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											The impact of this development on the surrounding environment would mean loss of habitat for insects and small animals on this field. Whilst this development is being undertaken children's ability to concentrate in the infants school will be impacted not to mention the air quality and noise from such a development polluting air during play outside.								to comply with ENV1 to ensure that all development proposals should contribute positively towards creating a visually attractive environment. Disruption to students education Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy SD6 which requires proposals to be submitted by a construction environment management plan to ensure that any adverse impacts of the development are sufficiently mitigated.	
0760-00	Individual	James	Stephens		Yes	HAD4	Yes		Yes			None: I think this policy would be an improvement.	Not Answered	Not Answered			Support for HAD4	Support noted.	N	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02																			
0794-0004	Individual	Daniel	Adams		Yes	HAD4	Yes		Yes		Whilst housing in this location seems a good use of no longer used land, the capacity and density calculation results in too many houses for such a small area, ie 114 homes is too many - 60 dwellings would be more appropriate.		Not Answered	Not Answered		A	Density proposed on Had4	Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	N
0840-0001	Individual	Carl	Hodgson		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Justified	Scrub lane is already a very busy road for traffic, particularly at school start and end times, it cannot cope with the additional traffic that this development would deliver		No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objects to HAD4 due to traffic on scrub lane	Traffic Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation.	N
0851-0001	Individual	Norman	Baxter		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Positively prepared	Already heavy traffic on a what is a narrow road especially when an incident occurs on the London Road	A much smaller number of homes in keeping with other properties in Scrub Lane especially considering number of parking spaces for families with multiple cars Take note of overspill of cars from Scrub Mews parking in Scrub Lane and causing traffic chaos	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objects to HAD4 due to traffic on scrub lane	Traffic Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation.	
0 8 5 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Pan kaj	Pate l		Yes	HA D4	No	The residents views especially on Scrub Lane should have been collected. No indication of impact on local services eg schools doctors dentist etc.	No	Positively prepared, Justified	The areas objective needs infact will be made worse by the increase in traffic problems. SCRUB LANE has been used as an alternative route at peak times when A13 London Road can't cope with traffic. The Humps were introduced on Scrub Lane to slow down and reduce traffic. It worked in the beginning but increase in traffic generally has brought back the problem. The part of the road next to the land is used by parents dropping and picking up children from the Local school. You should investigate this further before proposing that the new residents will be using Scrub Lane to get to their houses. Please look at the problem between Bilton and Seymour Road after only around 14 houses were built in the Mews! Building 114 house will mean almost over 200 cars/vans and where will these park, on Scrub Lane. Where will parents park for the SCHOOL Drops and pickups?	To make sound take a look at views of surrounding local residents and include them on your proposal under justified.	Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objects to HAD4 due to traffic on scrub lane and infrastructure	Traffic Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0853-0001	Individual	Jonathan	Astley		Yes	HAD4	No	I live in this area and will be adversely impacted by this proposed development and I haven't been consulted	No	Positively prepared	The area is overcrowded and there are insufficient local services such as doctors / dentists, additionally the road infrastructure is often blocked with traffic. I can see no benefit to anyone in the community by building further housing on this site.	It isn't a valid proposal therefore I believe for the benefit of the community development should not occur here.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objects to HAD4 due to traffic on scrub lane and infrastructure	Traffic Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
0854	Individual	Craig	Tipper		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Justified, Consistent	Too many properties proposed on size of site	Reduction in number of properties	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Density on site HAD4 too much	Density The density chosen for this site was	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 1										with national policy								informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	
0 8 5 5 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Jun e	Hen ders on		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	[Redacted Personal Information] and already the road gets grid locked from the amount of cars parked in between junctions of Bolton and broughton Road on scrub lane. This is because of the mini estate allowed to be built between these two junctions without adequate parking. It seems the average number of cars per household is now about three. Your proposal for 114 homes is scandalous as it would see at least another 250 to 300 cars. As it is scrublane is used as a rat run thus the the sleeping policemen already built into the road. This proposal has not taken in to account all the other local issues such as impact on already over subscribed surgeries and schooling.		No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Objects to HAD4 because: Traffic Parking Infrastructure	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		implemented. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0856-0001	Individual	Noton	Patel		Yes	HAD4	No	Not enough space for traffic flow on the roads, schools, health care, etc	No	Positively prepared, Justified	There is strain on Scrub Lane at the present with traffic. Not enough space for extra schools, health care, etc. No space for stationary cars on the road plus too near environmentally to the Nature Reserve.		No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objects to HAD4 because: Traffic Parking Infrastructure	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0 8 5 7 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Nei l	Burr ell		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Effective	By adding 114 new homes existing gp provisions will be put under serious strain more so than it currently is. Plus other amenities will struggle.		No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Objecting to HAD4 due to infrastructure	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0859-0001	Individual	Debbie	Bishop-laggett		Yes	HA D4	No	114 houses is far to many for a small area. Schools and doctor's surgeries would not have capacity for extra residents. Scrub Lane would become congested with extra houses, residents. Bus route would cause massive congestion and rendering already broken speed humps (put there to make roads safer for children) unusable.	No	Effective, Justified	Would overpopulate a small area with not enough infrastructure to cope with even more residents. Any bus routes going through scrub lane would cause huge traffic congestion for existing residents to be able to reach their own properties. With an elderly contingent of residents in the area it would make it difficult for ambulances to reach people in a timely manner	A maximum of 64 houses at most and for bus routes to remain on the london road as has always been the case. Bus routes in scrub lane would be extremely detrimental	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	
08600001	Individual	Joan	Burrell		Yes	HAD4	No	Not enough infrastructure to cope with 114 extra houses. Traffic wise the road can be like a traffic jam if there are problems on the A13 or A127 Scrub Lane is used as a cut through. With all the extra cars more housing would bring cars will struggle to move. We need more doctors as you can't get appointments now let alone having 200 plus more people possibly needing treatment.	No	Effective	Not practical		No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objects to HAD4 due to traffic on scrub lane and infrastructure	Traffic Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0861-0001	Individual	Rebecca	Kelly		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The current traffic and parking situation is already completely untenable. Cars are permanently parked along Scrub Lane creating congestion; this is exacerbated at school drop off and collection times. I have personally been involved in a car accident two months ago where the nature of the parking along Scrub Lane meant a driver took an unnecessary risk pulling onto the wrong side of the road, colliding with me and my two young children in the car. Since then; I have seen the aftermath of two further accidents on Scrub Lane alone. Similarly; parking at the end of the Conifers also creates a blind hazard for drivers turning into the road. All of this is the case as of right now; I shudder to think the extent to which this will be exacerbated by 114 new homes on the small field. Furthermore I find it incredible that the sheer volume of homes are capable of fitting onto that land. Whilst parking, traffic and congestion are the main reasons why the plans are unsound, I would also strongly query whether local services - primary schools, doctors etc - would be able to cope with the strain of the sheer volume of new people in such a small area. Finally, given how many properties it	There needs to be far greater consideration to the traffic situation, and consideration of new roads to cope with any development. Further, there needs to be consideration of the strain on local services. Finally; there should be consideration as to the actual plans and how so many homes will fit on the small amount of land.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											is intended to build on this land, there is absolutely no way they will be keeping with the character of this area of Hadleigh - largely detached family homes - and therefore not in keeping with the community that is established.							the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	
0863-0001	Individual	Peter	Watts		Yes	HA D4	No	The proposed number of 114 new homes being considered to be built, on such a small parcel of land, in an already tight and overpopulated area, is totally impractical. Please see attached, a brief snap-shot of pictures, reflecting the present and ongoing parking situation for the Conifers - which presumably, will only get worse - once the school's twice daily, drop-off/collection traffic, lose the present kirbside parking on Scrub Lane and parents look to park as close to the school as possible - which inevitably are the Greenacres and Conifers roads. Finally: the situation regarding the closure of our Doctors' Surgery in Rectory Road - "The Hollies" - is of great concern; and despite having received an email from a no-reply accurx3@nhs.net, on 21/11/2025, advising of the services available, the Surgery, it appears, is not in	No	Effective	Ticked this box only because a "none" box option was not offered. This area is totally unsuitable and cannot reasonably be considered to cope with the extra traffic, parking and already saturated traffic flows being experienced NOW. It is impossible to now travel along Scrub Lane - at any time of day (or night) - due to the extra parked cars along the Lane. As an example: The area around Scrub Mews - where there used to be one Bungalow - but now something like 12 + houses have been built - has produced parked cars from Bilton Road to Seymour Road - always a block of 9/10 vehicles on the south side of Scrub Lane - presumably the overspill of Scrub Mews residence. If you then take a moment to think of the times when Parents are dropping off/picking up young ones to the Infant school - the increased volume of traffic along Scrub Lane with the	The only necessary consideration with this site: This land should never have been proposed be built on, in the first instant.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	B	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Infrastructure	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								a position to hold in-house GP consultations, and it's not looking like they ever will - under the current circumstances, as the email states face-to-face appointments, at nearby sites ! This situation, hopefully, will be duly noted, therefore - along with the pending traffic problems - that we can't cope now and provide services for the existing population and really, this should all be rectified, before any increase in the housing population is further considered for this area.			rush-hour increased volumes - pretty much grid-locks Scrub Lane and the traffic lights phasing further enhances that delay. As a long time resident [REDACTED Personal Information] ; this issue does make it more difficult to get in and out of the Conifers. In addition - and as an example - to the growing parking/congestion issue - The Conifers now has a constant amount of commercial vans and cars being parked overnight and during the day - along the west side of our street, from residents who do not live here. This makes entering the street more difficult and not a great help to our excellent refuse collectors.							(Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0873-0001	Individual	Amber	Koyas		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	1. Green Belt Designation The Castle Point Green Belt Landscape Assessment (2010) identifies the area south of Scrub Lane as part of the Green Belt. It describes the land as a wedge-shaped area bounded by Benfleet Creek, Canvey Way, and the railway, containing fields, scrub, and a wildlife sanctuary. The assessment notes that the area is visually degraded by infrastructure but still serves the purposes of the Green Belt. Source: https://www.placeservices.co.uk/media/56565/greenbelt-landscape-assessment-castle-point.pdf 2. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) According to the NPPF, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where 'exceptional circumstances' are fully evidenced and justified. The draft Castle Point Plan does not demonstrate such circumstances for the release of Green Belt land south of Scrub Lane. Source: https://consultation.castlepoint.gov.uk/planning/the-castle-point-plan-pre-submission-regulation-19/user_uploads/castle-point-plan---regulation-19-draft---consultation-version---july-2025.pdf	To make the plan sound, the allocation HAD4: Land south of Scrub Lane (Page 72, Paragraph 10.31) should be deleted in its entirety. The site should not be allocated for housing because: • Its development would require release of Green Belt land without demonstrating exceptional circumstances, contrary to national policy. • Reasonable alternative sites, including brownfield and more sustainable options, are available and should be prioritised. • The site is not effective or deliverable within the plan period due to infrastructure, transport, and environmental constraints.	No	Not Answered	Yes	A	Objecting to HAD4 because: Shouldnt build on green belt land other alternative brownfield sites are available Transport Infrastructure	Policy HAD4 is not contained within the GreenBelt and therefore has been proposed. Other sites available All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Transport The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, assessing impacts and recommending local interventions. These are identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Alongside this, the Local Transport Authority, Essex County Council, have prepared the	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											3. Infrastructure and Transport Constraints Local residents have expressed concerns about the narrow roads on Scrub Lane, congestion during peak times, and limited public transport options. These issues suggest that the site may not be effectively deliverable within the plan period. Source: https://www.rebeccaharris.org/sites/www.rebeccaharris.org/files/2024-09/Rebecca%20Harris%20Local%20Plan%20Consultation%20Response%20AUG24.pdf 4. Flood Risk The Environment Agency's flood risk maps indicate that parts of the area south of Scrub Lane are within Flood Zones 2 and 3, meaning they are at risk of flooding. Development in these areas would need to pass the sequential and exception tests, which may not be achievable. Source: https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/ 5. Alternative Sites The Castle Point Plan Issues and Options document lists various potential development sites, including brownfield sites and areas with fewer constraints. The allocation of Green Belt land south of Scrub Lane appears to be an unnecessary choice when							Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex includes wider local improvements to transport networks in and around Castle Point, including improved linkages to other areas. Growth in Castle Point will facilitate the delivery of the proposals in the Local Transport Plan 4.	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											more suitable alternatives exist. Source: https://consultation.castlepoint.gov.uk/planning/castle-point-plan-issues-and-options/user_uploads/annex-a-1.pdf 6. Local Opposition Community groups like Save Castle Point have actively opposed the development of Green Belt land, including the site south of Scrub Lane. Their website provides a platform for residents to express concerns and objections. Source: https://www.savecastlepoint.co.uk/								
0 8 7 4 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Neil	Sayer		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Effective	114 new homes to be built on this already busy area will have a profound effect on traffic, parking and under-strain services, such as schools and doctors. Scrub Lane can not in any way support this amount of new housing in such a dense concentration	At most 20 houses could reasonably be built on this piece of land	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to HAD4 because: Parking Traffic Infrastructure Density	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 8 7 6 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	An dre w	McD onal d		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Effective, Justified	The plan does not meet the needs of the local residents, and is purely an academic exercise in how many properties can be placed on an individual site. The proposal for 114 new homes in Scrub Lane takes no account for the impact on local schools or local medical facilities. Such level of development will mean an additional 230 to 250 people in this area. Additionally no impact on the serious road congestion 200 plus vehicles will have. At peak times the road is almost grid locked any additional vehicles will only deteriorate the situation. Has an emergency services impact statement been arranged between 8.30 and 9.00 on weekdays?	More consultation with local residents needs. Perhaps a questionnaire to everyone living in the borough.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Objecting to HAD4 because: Traffic Parking Infrastructure Density Emergency Services impact	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Emergency Services Impact Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0 8 7 7 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Pat rici a	McD onal d		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Effective, Justified	Concerns regarding increased road traffic. Additional concerns regarding impact on local schools and medical facilities. Plus serious loss of green spaces.	More focused needs on the requirements of residents.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objecting to HAD4 because: Traffic Infrastructure Loss of Green Space	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Loss of Green Space This is a private piece of land with no public access or rights of way across it.	
0887-0001	Individual	Kevin	Gosling		Yes	HAD4	No		No	Positively prepared	Traffic, and the amount of homes on the site at scrub lane	Less houses, 114 new homes on this site.. is too large For the area.. Traffic will be impossible	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to HAD4: Traffic Density	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0893-0001	Individual	Lee	Glascock		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to register my strong objection to the proposed development of 114 new homes on Scrub Lane, adjacent to the local primary school. While I understand the need for housing, this particular proposal will create significant and lasting problems for both residents and the wider community. Traffic & Safety Concerns Scrub Lane is already used heavily as a cut-through from the A13 to Southend. At peak hours, traffic volumes are severe, and access to and from private driveways is extremely difficult. In my own experience, it is not uncommon for 10–20 cars to pass before there is an opportunity to exit the driveway safely. When there are delays or roadworks on the A13, congestion worsens to the point where traffic is bumper-to-bumper. Introducing 114 additional homes, many of which will have multiple car-owning households, will inevitably create gridlock. By conservative estimates, this could mean several hundred additional vehicles trying to access Scrub Lane daily, intensifying congestion, increasing air pollution, and raising the risk of accidents.		No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to HAD4 because: Traffic Parking Infrastructure Density	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required							
											The proposed access point via Scrub Lane is entirely unsuitable for such a volume of traffic. The volume already means that even a few parked cars currently cause severe obstructions and tailbacks. Scaling this up to account for hundreds of extra vehicles is simply unmanageable. Proximity to Primary School Locating new housing, including units for residents with complex needs, immediately beside a primary school raises serious safeguarding questions. While the definition of "complex needs" is broad, the placement of such accommodation next to a site where young children gather every day is not a wise or safe choice. At the very least, this requires much greater scrutiny before approval could even be considered. Pressure on Local Infrastructure Local services are already under immense strain. The primary school, which is small, will struggle to cope with the inevitable increase in pupil numbers, leading to overcrowded classrooms and reduced educational quality.														and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											The local GP surgery, situated at the end of Scrub Lane, is already oversubscribed. Personally, I have had to go without appointments despite living with chronic health conditions, simply because i cannot get through on the phone or get an actual appointment when i need it. Adding hundreds of new residents will make it virtually impossible for current patients to receive timely care. This is not only a local inconvenience but a serious public health issue. Local shopping facilities (Morrisons, Lidl, and others) are already stretched. Parking is difficult in peak times, and with several hundred new residents across Benfleet, Thundersley proposals and now this, demand will far exceed supply. This overdevelopment risks eroding the quality of life for everyone in the area. The road of scrub lane and surrounding area has always been considered as a peaceful and attractive area, with woodland and walks that bring in many visitors. It seems all that's happening is we are constantly cramming housing into the area (scrub lane mews and now this). When will it stop ? When the natural beauty of the area is									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											gone? Cumulative Impact It is vital to consider this proposal in the wider context of ongoing development in Castle Point. The cumulative effect of large-scale building projects is leaving residents feeling cramped in, with infrastructure lagging far behind housing expansion. Roads, schools, healthcare, and local services are already inadequate. Adding this development will simply worsen every existing problem. Conclusion This application is wholly inappropriate for Scrub Lane. The severe traffic problems, risks to child safety, overstretched healthcare and education services, and the cumulative overdevelopment of Castle Point make this proposal unsustainable. I urge the Council to reject this application and instead seek alternative, more suitable sites that do not jeopardise the wellbeing of existing residents and the safety of our children.								
0898-00	Individual	Richard	Frake		Yes	HAD4	No	This plan does not consider local traffic and parking which already straining heavily on local traffic. What with the school, ,many using Scrub Lane a cut through to avoid congestion on the London	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	This plan does not consider local infrastructure, traffic and parking which already straining heavily. What with the school, many using Scrub Lane a cut through to avoid congestion on the London Road. With another	Lack of consideration of the effect on local amenities (Schools, Doctors & Dentists), traffic and parking	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to HAD4: Traffic Infrastructure	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
01								Road. With another 114 homes this will only make to situation impossible to a point of gridlock. As a resident of Conifers it is bad enough already .This also fails to consider strain on local serviced The Hollies Doctors Surgery is already impossible to get an appointment, an another 114 home will only increase that burden.			114 homes this will only make to situation impossible to a point of gridlock. As a resident of Conifers it is bad enough already .This also fails to consider strain on local serviced The Hollies Doctors Surgery is already impossible to get an appointment, an another 114 home will only increase that burden.							which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
09000001	Individual	STEVE	BERRY		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	First of all, can I just say that 3b is not the sort of question you ask local residents, many of them elderly and not very computer-literate. Those who have compiled the local plan are not personally invested in the suggested development of this plot so they may consider the proposal and the overall plan as positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national planning policy. We, as	Not for us to do. There is consideration of the existing neighbours, the impact on the current infrastructure, the knock-on effect of significant traffic jams, etc etc. The only change I wish to insist upon is the removal of the number 114 and its replacement by the number 14.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to HAD4 because: Traffic Parking Infrastructure Density	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											residents, are looking at this from the perspective of how it impacts our everyday lives....and it is hugely personal to all of us. This proposed development does not take into account the existing neighbourhood's needs which are falling short in so many ways and have been for some time. The doctor's surgery in Rectory Road is already understaffed and swamped with patients that it is difficult to get an appointment at short notice and non-urgent appointments can take weeks. The traffic issues in Scrub Lane are notoriously bad (partly down to school parking twice a day but also due to Scrub Lane Mews that was a poorly thought-out planning approval!) and whenever there is a problem on the A127 or A13 then Scrub Lane is always the rat-run that leads to local gridlock. 114 residences is a ridiculous number of dwellings to dump on this site. It is in no way consistent with the type of housing currently on Scrub Lane. Indeed, 14 houses is probably the sort of size of homes that this plot could accommodate. 114 dwellings would likely add a minimum of 114 cars exiting on to Scrub Lane. There are no multi-storey buildings currently in the vicinity and I cannot see any other way of								proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Density The density chosen for this site was informed by	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required							
											providing 114 homes with 114 parking spaces on such a small plot. There does not yet seem to be any information about adding to the infrastructure with doctors surgery, additional school places etc and these, as mentioned above, are already over-run with applicants/patients from the existing neighbourhood. In short, you are trying to compensate the inadequacy and failure of countless councils in order to appease Central Government demands for more housing. Our neighbourhood is already overrun with over-development and this is massive overkill on a small plot. I therefore wish to add my objections to the argument against this proposed development. It is not going to mirror the current housing that faces the plot opposite, it will cause a significant deterioration in traffic along Scrub Lane, particularly if parking spills onto Scrub Lane as is the case with the awful Scrub Lane Mews bottleneck. The schools will be overrun with demand for places more so than ever and so too the doctor's surgery, The Hollies. If there has to be development on this land then make it match the existing neighbourhood as														the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											your Planning Officers are instructed to ensure, but I challenge any architect to come up with such a design which includes 114 properties on this small plot and which complies with that regulation.								
0 9 0 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Arne	Carlson		Yes	HAD4	Yes		Yes			With regard to HAD4, this land cannot support the proposed 114 homes. Ideally I would prefer this to be developed as playing fields but if it has to be developed, it should be in keeping with the remainder of Scrub Lane. There are only 10/11 houses opposite this site and 2 down each side. A policy of in-keeping should consider no more than 30 homes. How 114 homes will fit with adequate parking of at least 2 spaces is incomprehensible. The development of Scrub Lane Mews shows how a cramped design has negatively impacted the area and 114 homes would be a huge mistake and a quota of 30 homes would be more reasonable. The reason for this is as follows:-It will be sympathetic to the existing homes layout-Scrub Lane traffic and parking is getting worse each week. The building of Scrub Lane Mews	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Air quality	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
												has caused so many parking issues which ECC will do nothing about despite issues being raised around dangers to school children, road rage and the fact that Scrub Lane is often used as a cut through when the A13 is obstructed and on many occasions, you cannot move down the road due to congestion-The local doctor and dentist surgeries cannot cope with the current population of this area-The utilities are always failing particularly the water pipework-It will be safer for pupils attending both of the Hadleigh schools-Our own road - Woodland Close, has over 17 'track it ' issues with ECC which have not been attended to and to neglect existing residents over new development is a real failing of Essex overall, irrespective of what falls under ECC or CPBC. - There will be significant increase in levels of pollution both with the building work and the additional homes.- 30 homes would offer a greater chance of green space and planting as opposed to the 'concrete over ' method which is counter to the vision and objectives and the information on page 24 /6.27							the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. DensityThe density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.Air QualityAir quality impacts are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal, under objective 9.1. Annual Status Reports for Castle Point can be found on the Essex Air website along with further information relating to air quality within Castle Point. Castle Point monitor nitrogen dioxide using diffusion tubes at 30	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		monitoring locations around the district. The main source of pollution in the Borough is road traffic emissions from major roads, notably the A13, A127 and A130. The Council has not declared any Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). Generally, air pollution is low in Castle Point. Results from the monitoring points across the Borough suggest that air quality is improving.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 9 0 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Nic ola	Carl sen		Yes	HA D4	Yes		Ye s			With regard to HAD4, this land cannot support the proposed 114 homes. Ideally I would prefer this to be developed as playing fields but if it has to be developed, it should be in keeping with the remainder of Scrub Lane. There are only 10/11 houses opposite this site and 2 down each side. A policy of in-keeping should consider no more than 30 homes. How 114 homes will fit with adequate parking of at least 2 spaces is incomprehensible. The development of Scrub Lane Mews shows how a cramped design has negatively impacted the area and 114 homes would be a huge mistake and a quota of 30 homes would be more reasonable. The reason for this is as follows: -It will be sympathetic to the existing homes layout -Scrub Lane traffic and parking is getting worse each week. The building of Scrub Lane Mews has caused so many parking issues which ECC will do nothing about despite issues being raised around dangers to school children, road rage and the fact that Scrub Lane is often used as a cut through when the A13 is obstructed and on many occasions, you cannot move down the road due to congestion	No t An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Air quality	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												-The local doctor and dentist surgeries cannot cope with the current population of this area -The utilities are always failing particularly the water pipework -It will be safer for pupils attending both of the Hadleigh schools -Our own road - Woodland Close, has over 17 'track it ' issues with ECC which have not been attended to and to neglect existing residents over new development is a real failing of Essex overall, irrespective of what falls under ECC or CPBC. - There will be significant increase in levels of pollution both with the building work and the additional homes. - 30 homes would offer a greater chance of green space and planting as opposed to the 'concrete over ' method which is counter to the vision and objectives and the information on page 24 /6.27 -the proposal to add cycle lanes will be very risky given the existing parking hazards and said congestion above. Parking needs to be banned on this road irrespective of any new development						the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Air Quality Air quality impacts are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal, under objective 9.1. Annual Status Reports for Castle Point can be found on the Essex Air website along with further information relating to air quality within Castle Point. Castle Point monitor nitrogen dioxide using diffusion tubes at 30 monitoring locations around the district. The main source of pollution in the Borough is road traffic emissions from major roads, notably	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		the A13, A127 and A130. The Council has not declared any Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). Generally, air pollution is low in Castle Point. Results from the monitoring points across the Borough suggest that air quality is improving.	
0 9 0 3 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Nic ola	Carl sen		Yes	HA D4	Yes		Ye s			page 66 - section 10.9 states that new cycle infrastructure will be added to New Road/Scrub Land and Daws Heath road. I would really welcome this but current levels of parking are too dangerous to include this. The ability to park especially in Scrub Lane should be removed at certain times of the day.	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Welcomes cycle infrastructure to policy HAD4 but requires parking on scrub lane to be banned	Parking restrictions are controlled by the local highways authority which is Essex County Council.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 9 0 4 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Pau l	Carl sen		Yes	HA D4	Yes		Ye s			With regard to HAD4, this land cannot support the proposed 114 homes. Ideally I would prefer this to be developed as playing fields but if it has to be developed, it should be in keeping with the remainder of Scrub Lane. There are only 10/11 houses opposite this site and 2 down each side. A policy of in-keeping should consider no more than 30 homes. How 114 homes will fit with adequate parking of at least 2 spaces is incomprehensible. The development of Scrub Lane Mews shows how a cramped design has negatively impacted the area and 114 homes would be a huge mistake and a quota of 30 homes would be more reasonable. The reason for this is as follows: -It will be sympathetic to the existing homes layout -Scrub Lane traffic and parking is getting worse each week. The building of Scrub Lane Mews has caused so many parking issues which ECC will do nothing about despite issues being raised around dangers to school children, road rage and the fact that Scrub Lane is often used as a cut through when the A13 is obstructed and on many occasions, you cannot move down the road due to congestion	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Air quality	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												-The local doctor and dentist surgeries cannot cope with the current population of this area -The utilities are always failing particularly the water pipework -It will be safer for pupils attending both of the Hadleigh schools -Our own road - Woodland Close, has over 17 'track it ' issues with ECC which have not been attended to and to neglect existing residents over new development is a real failing of Essex overall, irrespective of what falls under ECC or CPBC. - There will be significant increase in levels of pollution both with the building work and the additional homes. - 30 homes would offer a greater chance of green space and planting as opposed to the 'concrete over ' method which is counter to the vision and objectives and the information on page 24 /6.27 -the proposal to add cycle lanes will be very risky given the existing parking hazards and said congestion above. Parking needs to be banned on this road irrespective of any new development						the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Air Quality Air quality impacts are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal, under objective 9.1. Annual Status Reports for Castle Point can be found on the Essex Air website along with further information relating to air quality within Castle Point. Castle Point monitor nitrogen dioxide using diffusion tubes at 30 monitoring locations around the district. The main source of pollution in the Borough is road traffic emissions from major roads, notably	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		the A13, A127 and A130. The Council has not declared any Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). Generally, air pollution is low in Castle Point. Results from the monitoring points across the Borough suggest that air quality is improving.	
0 9 0 4 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Paul	Carl sen		Yes	HAD4	Yes		Yes			page 66 - section 10.9 states that new cycle infrastructure will be added to New Road/Scrub Land and Daws Heath road. I would really welcome this but current levels of parking are too dangerous to include this. The ability to park especially in Scrub Lane should be removed at certain times of the day. Furthermore, the New Road junction to the A13 is awful and the congestion in New road to access the A13 is often impossible to use. This is exacerbated by Morrisons only having one exit route from the store. An exit onto the A13 would help local traffic to gain access to the A13 with greater ease.	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Welcomes cycle infrastructure to policy HAD4 but requires parking on scrub lane to be banned	Parking restrictions are controlled by the local highways authority which is Essex County Council.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0916-0001	Individual	Stuart	Cooper		Yes	HAD4	Yes	N/a	No	Consistent with national policy	Re: Objection to Policy HAD4 – Land South of Scrub Lane, Hadleigh (Proposed Allocation of at least 114 Dwellings) I write to object to the proposed allocation of at least 114 dwellings on Land South of Scrub Lane (Policy HAD4) in the Draft Castle Point Plan (Regulation 19, 2025). I believe the proposal conflicts with national planning policy (NPPF, 2024), UK environmental legislation (Environment Act 2021), and Castle Point’s own strategic and place-based policies. For the reasons set out below, the allocation should be refused or substantially modified. --- 1. Overdevelopment and Density Policy HAD4 allocates at least 114 homes on a site of approximately one hectare. This represents an excessively high density for a greenfield edge-of-settlement location. Castle Point Policy SP2 (“Making effective use of urban land and creating sustainable places”) requires density targets to reflect the characteristics of different areas. The Scrub	Abandon the development of the green space south of Scrub Lane. Please refer to all other comments in this Objection.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Green Belt	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											Lane site lies on the urban edge of Hadleigh, adjacent to open countryside, and such an intensive scheme would undermine local character. NPPF Paragraphs 119–120 require efficient land use, but emphasise that development density must reflect the prevailing character and setting. This allocation does not respect those principles and risks creating cramped, poor-quality living environments. --- 2. Loss of Green Land and Environmental Value The site is presently open green land providing important ecosystem services — biodiversity, carbon sequestration, flood absorption, and landscape character. Castle Point Policy SP1 (“Supporting an enhancement of the Borough’s green spaces”) requires the protection and enhancement of green space. HAD4 would result in its permanent loss. NPPF Paragraphs 179–180 require policies and decisions to protect and													the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Green Belt This land is not allocated as Green Belt	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
											enhance valued landscapes and biodiversity, to deliver net gains, and to maintain ecological networks. Under the Environment Act 2021, development must provide a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. With such intensive use, it is unclear how HAD4 could achieve this without substantial off-site measures. --- 3. Infrastructure Capacity Development of 114 dwellings would generate significant additional demand on local infrastructure, services, and utilities. Castle Point Policy SP4 (“Development contributions”) requires that new development must provide adequate contributions to education, healthcare, transport, and utilities. No clear mitigation strategy has been presented for HAD4. NPPF Chapter 8 requires planning decisions to ensure sufficient provision of community facilities and services. Schools, GP surgeries, and local roads in										

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											Hadleigh are already under pressure and risk being overburdened. --- 4. Flood Risk and Drainage Castle Point is particularly vulnerable to flood risk, and development on greenfield sites can exacerbate surface water flooding. NPPF Paragraphs 167–169 (Chapter 14) require development to be directed away from areas at highest flood risk, and to provide robust mitigation including sustainable drainage systems (SUDS). The Castle Point Plan’s policies on climate resilience (SD1–SD3) similarly require comprehensive flood mitigation and sustainable drainage. HAD4 does not provide adequate assurances in this respect. --- 5. Design Quality and Local Character High-quality design is a core principle of sustainable development.									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											The Castle Point Residential Design Guidance (2013) requires adequate space standards, privacy, amenity space, landscaping, and parking provision. A scheme of 114 dwellings on this site is unlikely to comply with these requirements. NPPF Paragraph 130 (Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places) requires that developments: function well and add to the quality of the area; are sympathetic to local character and landscape setting; provide attractive layouts with adequate landscaping; and establish a strong sense of place. The HAD4 allocation, at its proposed density, would fail to achieve these objectives. --- 6. Green Belt / Countryside Considerations If the site falls within, or adjacent to, Green Belt designation:									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											NPPF Paragraphs 142–160 confirm that Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. Protecting openness and preventing urban sprawl are fundamental. The HAD4 allocation does not demonstrate exceptional justification. Even if not formally designated, the site contributes to the openness and character of Hadleigh’s edge and should be safeguarded. --- 7. Legal and Policy Inconsistencies The allocation conflicts with Castle Point Strategic Policies SP1, SP2, and SP4, as well as HAD4’s own requirement to deliver sustainable and context-appropriate growth. It conflicts with the NPPF (2024) requirements in Chapters 11, 12, 14, and 15. It may fail to comply with the Environment Act 2021 requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											--- Conclusion Policy HAD4 – Land South of Scrub Lane is unsound because: It represents overdevelopment of a sensitive greenfield edge-of-settlement site. It causes the irreversible loss of valued green land, contrary to Castle Point and national policy. It places unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure and services. It lacks robust provision for flood risk mitigation, biodiversity, and green infrastructure. It fails the tests of soundness set out in the NPPF (positively prepared, justified, effective, consistent with national policy). For these reasons, I respectfully urge Castle Point Borough Council to remove or substantially amend Policy HAD4 from the Draft Plan.								
0919	Individual	Michael	Payne		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Justified	I do not believe that 100+ new homes sighted next to a primary school would be reasonable. A better use for		No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to HAD4 Location next to primary school would be better	Comments noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 1											the land would be an extension of the school grounds with additional buildings to the school to accommodate more places for children to attend. It could encompass a special educational needs provision for children in the area which hadleigh currently lacks.						used for school extension		
0 9 2 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Sam	Preston		Yes	HAD4	No	It has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Positively prepared, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Justified - whilst it states that building should be in keeping with the aesthetic of Scrub Lanes other homes, it fails to account for 114 homes squeezed into a space that the rest of scrub lane would expect a maximum of 20 homes. The homes in this area have green spaces for families and do not seek to squeeze. Additionally the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. Consistent with national policy: It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines.	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Revise Scrub Lane development to 20 family homes. Total housing target of 11,000.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West Thundersley No five year housing land supply Objecting to number of houses on HAD4 Green/Grey Belt	North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4)	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											The Had4 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic proposal for 114 homes, using the Castle Point Density and Capacity Study, and a 100dph urban guide, in a residential area of housing currently having homes at 20dph. Housing on this site at 100dph would equate to six blocks of flats, four flats per floor, and four stories high, which is out of character for the area. The statement that the frontage of the development is designed to reflect the character of Scrub Lane, is a complete fabrication, as the houses opposite relates to approx. 15dph and it will never match the current street scene. The addition of 114 homes, and over 200 cars, would cause major issues at the Scrub Lane / Rectory Rod traffic lights. The local plan is based on the total over development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. The plan also needs amending as							outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. No Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites.							target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper. Density on HAD4 The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0938-0001	Individual	Joanne	Guyett		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Justified - The frontage of the development would not reflect the character of the area. Consideration should be given to the site - The North West Thundersley. 114 homes on this area of land (using the Castle Point Density and Capacity Study, and 100dph urban guide) would equate to six blocks of flats, four stories high. This is completely out of character for the area and would cause no end of traffic issues as well as GP surgeries and schools unable to cope. The local secondary school is already full and children are having to travel further afield for a school place. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic and there is a lack of infrastructure, drainage and sewage in the urban area, therefore is not of effective soundness.	In order to be Justified, consideration of The North West Thundersley site should be considered as an alternative to this site. This would reduce the over development of urban sites.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objects to HAD4 because: Density Traffic Infrastructure Allocate North West Thundersley instead	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		was not preferred.	
0 9 4 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Call um	Pick rell		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No			The proposed site-Had4 - Land South of Scrub Lane for 114 new homes is not practical. Throughout the week during the school run all you have to do is go down scrub lane and you'll see how busy it is already, adding 114 houses to that plot of land with an average of 2 cars per family is over 200 additional cars on the road. The foundations are simply not setup to support this, not to mention the impact it will have on all the local amenities. The trees down scrub lane which make it a pleasant road to walk down would all be cut down and replaced with ugly new build houses.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Objects to HAD4 because: increased number of cars Infrastructure	Increased number of cars Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0942-0001	Individual	Tim	Wratislaw		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Justified	The plan to add 114 new homes to this area of land, whilst meeting a national ask, doesn't take into account the already horrendous parking and general traffic conditions extant in the area. Taking the average number of vehicles per household being 2 per household, the plan seeks to add a further 228 vehicles into an already highly congested road. This is at the end of the development process. The traffic and parking issues during development of the site in question, with the additional heavy machinery and heavy vehicles required, will not only destroy the road and pavement surfaces, but render the route impassable for long periods congesting surrounding roads. This also doesn't take into account any works/incidents that frequently take place along the A13 which leads to Scrub Lane becoming a cut through and exacerbating traffic problems. Furthermore, there isn't the capacity at the local Infant and Junior schools, let alone Dentists and GP surgeries, to accommodate the additional need that 114 extra homes will require. The infrastructure and locale of each school (Infants and Juniors) means it is next to impossible to build the	The modification would be to remove this site as an option for development and then to revise the plan to include the addition of further schools and medical facilities to cater for the increased population. Scrub Lane as a road cannot accommodate any more traffic than it already has to contend with, which also raises questions on the viability written into the plan identifying Scrub Lane as ripe for addition of a cycle lane - the road is just not big enough to cope!	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Infrastructure Air quality	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											additional classrooms that would be required. This leaves the final issue I have with this part of the plan, and that is the effect on the air quality right next to an Infant and Nursery school. The amount of pollution produced by construction vehicles right next to the school, with children playing outside at frequent points in the day, is an intolerable idea and causes a long-term threat to the children's health!							the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Air Quality Air quality impacts are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal, under objective 9.1. Annual Status Reports for Castle Point can be found on the Essex Air website along with further information relating to air quality within Castle Point. Castle Point monitor	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		nitrogen dioxide using diffusion tubes at 30 monitoring locations around the district. The main source of pollution in the Borough is road traffic emissions from major roads, notably the A13, A127 and A130. The Council has not declared any Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). Generally, air pollution is low in Castle Point. Results from the monitoring points across the Borough suggest that air quality is improving.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0949-0001	Individual	Clare	Dumontier		Yes	HAD4	Yes	N/A	No	Consistent with national policy	We write to object to the proposed allocation of at least 114 dwellings on Land South of Scrub Lane (Policy HAD4) in the Draft Castle Point Plan (Regulation 19, 2025). I believe the proposal conflicts with national planning policy (NPPF, 2024), UK environmental legislation (Environment Act 2021), and Castle Point's own strategic and place-based policies. For the reasons set out below, the allocation should be refused or substantially modified. . Overdevelopment and Density Policy HAD4 allocates at least 114 homes on a site of approximately one hectare. This represents an excessively high density for a greenfield edge-of-settlement location. Castle Point Policy SP2 ("Making effective use of urban land and creating sustainable places") requires density targets to reflect the characteristics of different areas. The Scrub Lane site lies on the urban edge of Hadleigh, adjacent to open countryside, and such an intensive scheme would undermine local character. NPPF Paragraphs 119-120 require efficient land use, but emphasise that	Withdraw the proposed development o the green space south of scrub lane. Please see all above comments.	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Green Belt	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											development density must reflect the prevailing character and setting. This allocation does not respect those principles and risks creating cramped, poor-quality living environments. --- 2. Loss of Green Land and Environmental Value The site is presently open green land providing important ecosystem services — biodiversity, carbon sequestration, flood absorption, and landscape character. Castle Point Policy SP1 (“Supporting an enhancement of the Borough’s green spaces”) requires the protection and enhancement of green space. HAD4 would result in its permanent loss. NPPF Paragraphs 179–180 require policies and decisions to protect and enhance valued landscapes and biodiversity, to deliver net gains, and to maintain ecological networks. Under the Environment Act 2021, development must provide a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. With such intensive use, it is													the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Green Belt This land is not allocated as Green Belt	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											unclear how HAD4 could achieve this without substantial off-site measures. --- 3. Infrastructure Capacity Development of 114 dwellings would generate significant additional demand on local infrastructure, services, and utilities. Castle Point Policy SP4 (“Development contributions”) requires that new development must provide adequate contributions to education, healthcare, transport, and utilities. No clear mitigation strategy has been presented for HAD4. NPPF Chapter 8 requires planning decisions to ensure sufficient provision of community facilities and services. Schools, GP surgeries, and local roads in Hadleigh are already under pressure and risk being overburdened. --- 4. Flood Risk and Drainage									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											Castle Point is particularly vulnerable to flood risk, and development on greenfield sites can exacerbate surface water flooding. NPPF Paragraphs 167–169 (Chapter 14) require development to be directed away from areas at highest flood risk, and to provide robust mitigation including sustainable drainage systems (SUDS). The Castle Point Plan’s policies on climate resilience (SD1–SD3) similarly require comprehensive flood mitigation and sustainable drainage. HAD4 does not provide adequate assurances in this respect. --- 5. Design Quality and Local Character High-quality design is a core principle of sustainable development. The Castle Point Residential Design Guidance (2013) requires adequate space standards, privacy, amenity space, landscaping, and parking provision. A scheme of 114 dwellings on this site is unlikely to comply with these requirements.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
											NPPF Paragraph 130 (Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places) requires that developments: function well and add to the quality of the area; are sympathetic to local character and landscape setting; provide attractive layouts with adequate landscaping; and establish a strong sense of place. The HAD4 allocation, at its proposed density, would fail to achieve these objectives. --- 6. Green Belt / Countryside Considerations If the site falls within, or adjacent to, Green Belt designation: NPPF Paragraphs 142–160 confirm that Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. Protecting openness and preventing urban sprawl are fundamental. The HAD4 allocation does not demonstrate exceptional										

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											justification. Even if not formally designated, the site contributes to the openness and character of Hadleigh’s edge and should be safeguarded. --- 7. Legal and Policy Inconsistencies The allocation conflicts with Castle Point Strategic Policies SP1, SP2, and SP4, as well as HAD4’s own requirement to deliver sustainable and context-appropriate growth. It conflicts with the NPPF (2024) requirements in Chapters 11, 12, 14, and 15. It may fail to comply with the Environment Act 2021 requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain. --- Conclusion Policy HAD4 – Land South of Scrub Lane is unsound because: It represents overdevelopment of a									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											sensitive greenfield edge-of-settlement site. It causes the irreversible loss of valued green land, contrary to Castle Point and national policy. It places unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure and services. It lacks robust provision for flood risk mitigation, biodiversity, and green infrastructure. It fails the tests of soundness set out in the NPPF (positively prepared, justified, effective, consistent with national policy). For these reasons, I respectfully urge Castle Point Borough Council to remove or substantially amend Policy HAD4 from the Draft Plan.									
0953-0001	Individual	John	Bryce		Yes	HAD4	No	The draft document leaves far too many relevant and significant points underdeveloped and inconclusive which legally should be resolved prior to seeking of approval e.g the provision of alternative sporting facilities where there is only a vague and indeterminate availability of additional funds and a reference to there being further discussions with the	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	There are too many vagaries and incomplete explanations on the solutions to the relevant problems arising from this development e.g., parking of the additional vehicles which will be brought to site by new homeowners ; enhanced safety requirements for children attending the school; full consultation on the loss of sporting facilities both for	Please see some of my principal concerns in 3c . These are not matters to be dealt with by " any revised wording ".	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character Lack of provision of alternative sporting facilities	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the	N	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								Council on alternative facilities without naming these there being no indication that such facilities with the requisite spare or additional capacity to cater for the usage now being removed from the site HAD4 Land South of Scrub Lane .			the general public and the school; enhanced child safety and protection arising from the increased presence of unknown adults; discussion on the ability and capacity of the affected schools to cope with the influx of additional children across the full age spectrum The foregoing list is not exhaustive. This was a poor effort and demands abandonment of the proposal altogether given the large number of relevant aspects which have been left unaddressed and /or poorly dealt with.							highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Loss of sporting facilities Policy HAD4 requires that the loss of the playing field is	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		mitigated by an appropriate financial contribution towards new or enhances playing field facilities nearby.	
0 9 5 6 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Luc y	Gar woo d		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective	The plan to put 114 new homes on this site south of Scrub lane, would be unnecessary over-development of the area. With little to no thought about the impact the extra traffic and vehicle parking would place on the already strained road network in the area.	There would be less objection to a significantly lower volume of housing in that area 10-20 new homes, that would not result in the lose of an outdoor space used by the locals. This lower volume of housing would also not cause a severe strain on the local roads.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	
0 9 6 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ric har d	Davi es		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No		The proposed development of this vast number of homes will add to an area that is already highly populated, increasing traffic in an already busy area. There also aren't the school places/doctors etc to support this, It will place too much pressure on an already busy area.	It will need to take into account the increase amount of traffic and pressure on public services.	No t An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Infrastructure	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
0966-0003	Individual	Matthew	Engl and		Yes	HAD4	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. The Had4 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic proposal for 114 homes, using the Castle Point Density and Capacity Study, and a 100dph urban guide, in a residential area of housing currently having homes at 20dph. Housing on this site at 100dph would equate to	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Revise Scrub Lane development to 20 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No	Not Answered			Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											six blocks of flats, four flats per floor, and four stories high, which is out of character for the area. The statement that the frontage of the development is designed to reflect the character of Scrub Lane, is a complete fabrication, as the houses opposite relates to approx. 15dph and it will never match the current street scene. The addition of 114 homes, and over 200 cars, would cause major issues at the Scrub Lane / Rectory Rod traffic lights.							the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	
0 9 6 7 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Kell y	Bulli s		Yes	HA D4	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure,	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Revise Scrub Lane development to 20 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	No	Not Ans wer ed		A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. The Had4 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic proposal for 114 homes, using the Castle Point Density and Capacity Study, and a 100dph urban guide, in a residential area of housing currently having homes at													application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											20dph. Housing on this site at 100dph would equate to six blocks of flats, four flats per floor, and four stories high, which is out of character for the area. The statement that the frontage of the development is designed to reflect the character of Scrub Lane, is a complete fabrication, as the houses opposite relates to approx. 15dph and it will never match the current street scene. The addition of 114 homes, and over 200 cars, would cause major issues at the Scrub Lane / Rectory Rod traffic lights.								
0913-0001	Individual	Marilyn	Smale	RESIDENT	Yes	HAD4	Yes		Yes	Consistent with national policy		Traffic in Scrub Lane is increasing and between 7.30am to 9.00am and 4pm to 6pm is heavy leading to congestion and tail backs approaching Rectory Road. Scrub Lane is now used as a cut through to avoid the A13 through Hadleigh. The addition of 114 New Homes on this site will lead to more traffic congestion and residents parking in Scrub Lane will further restrict the flow of traffic.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented.	
0 9 9 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ric hard	Bate s		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Justified	There is no justification for such an obscene number of properties being built on this small piece of land - even more so given previous failed attempts to push through similar projects in the past for far fewer homes. The impact this will have in terms of traffic locally and cars being parked on neighbouring streets is a huge concern in its own right. The environmental impact of this being built next to Hadleigh Infants and Nursery School with the playground so close by is also a major issue - particularly given the length of time this project would take to complete. This land should return to its initial state as a playing field or be considered as an opportunity to create further sport and recreation facilities as part of the Castle Point Playing Pitch Strategy. Local children attending Hadleigh Junior School and Hadleigh Infants		No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Objecting to HAD4: Traffic Impact of development on the school Engage with sport england to restore to playing pitch	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Development disruption Impact of any works will be mitigated by a construction environment management	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											and Nursery School would benefit hugely from the facility as well as residents, community groups and sports teams. Hadleigh has the potential to be considered a real leader, not just in terms of the Borough but County-wide, for local sport and recreation facilities and is passing up a huge opportunity. Why not consult Sport England or Fields in Trust on how we can transform this site and think about the longer-term benefits this would have for local residents, businesses and the community as a whole?							plan in accordance with policy SD6 to ensure that disruption is sufficiently mitigated. Loss of Playing Pitch Policy HAD4 includes mitigation for the loss of the playing field.	
0 9 9 6 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ge m ma	Ball		Yes	HA D4	No	This is an inappropriate question to ask someone whose background is not in local governance or planning policy. I cannot offer an opinion either way as to whether the plan is legally compliant.	No	Positively prepared	The definition of 'sound' provided states: "Positively prepared - provides a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs". As a local resident, one of the needs of the area is very clearly improved infrastructure, specifically with regards to road lay-outs and traffic flow. There is constantly and consistently issues with traffic passing through Hadleigh. Focusing on the HAD4 development, [Redacted Personal Information]and so I have first hand experience of the roads immediately surrounding this proposed development, and have experienced these roads over the past three years.	To make the plan sound, it would need to include suggestions, backed up by evidence, as to how the addition of 140 homes on Scrub Lane would not negatively impact the parents and children of Hadleigh Infants and Hadleigh Junior school, along with the homeowners in the surrounding roads. It would need to introduce alternative, free, areas of parking with sufficient spaces for the families of all children at the schools within a safe, close, walkable distance. It would also need to demonstrate that the addition of 140 new homes, which brings with it the families living in those homes and their children, could be factored into the current	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objecting to HAD4: Traffic Parking for school parents and school places	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking for	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											They are already not fit for purpose on a typical school run. The traffic is such that is regularly causes gridlocks and there are multiple, regular complaints form local homeowners to the schools about the traffic and parking, which often appear in the parents newsletters. The traffic is known to cause a lot of issues with local residents who live on Scrub Lane, Bilton Road, The Avenue, Church Road and Meadow Road, in particular. Scrub Lane is one of the primary places to park for Infants school parents as there is a large stretch of road, next to the proposed development site, which does not block driveways etc. Infants school parents try to be mindful of not causing chaos on Bilton Road (the front and main entrance to the Infants school) and do, where possible, park on Scrub Lane. For the moment, I am ignoring the impact of the additional 140 homes, purely looking at the current status of the roads; if this ability to park in Scrub Lane is removed it will cause undue detriment to the local residents surrounding the school, whilst also making it very difficult for parents to find free parking close to school. I do appreciate that the answer is "walk to school", however, my family	levels of traffic flow (particularly at peak times), acknowledging that there is currently gridlock in the surrounding roads on a very regular basis. Looking at school catchments, scrutiny of the school places would need to be included. Not only an assessment of how many additional school places would be required and how this would be catered for from a practical perspective, but also how the school catchment zones would need to be considered. As above, this would likely have left my son unable to get a place in any of the three closest schools to our house because of the layout of the catchment zones.												school parents and school places Unfortunately this is an matter of Essex County Council as the Education Authority to address.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											is a prime example of why it is not always that simple [Redacted Personal Information] is not feasible for working parents who have to drop their children off at 8.45am whilst still being home, logged on to work at 9.00am. In this modern age where the cost of living is so high, both parents have to work and so driving is becoming somewhat of a necessity as parents literally run back out of school to make it home in time for work (for those of us who are lucky enough to work from home/hybrid working etc.). For the reasons above, I feel the proposed development not does not provide "a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs". To the contrary, it in fact worsens the current issues already experienced with parking and traffic flow and does nothing to provide any improvement. Now I wish to address school places; as I have eluded to above, my children were allocated to Hadleigh Infants school. I have provided my address as part of this consultation and so you will be able to look at the local schools and corresponding catchments. We applied to Westwood Academy, Thundersley Primary and Hadleigh Infants school. Westwood is a one form								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											entry and is always over subscribed. We were not given a place despite this being the only school that we are technically in the catchment area for. Whilst we are not catchment for the other schools we applied as 'back-ups' being the next two closest school. I understand that Thundersley is also at capacity along with Hadleigh Infants. If you introduced 140 new homes right next to Hadleigh Infants school they would presumably be 'prime catchment', given the locality to that school. Had they existed at the time my children were applying to school, where would my children have been offered places? The suggestion of developing 140 homes right next to the school not only requires more school places in the area, but will also need consideration given to how this impacts the boundaries of school catchment zones. Taking this back to the question of, is the Draft Plan sound? Again, considering school placements, the answer has to be that it is not. The suggestion to develop these houses does not positively impact the areas objectively assessed needs. As above, it overburdens our schools and leaves children in the wider Hadleigh and surrounding areas at risk of								

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											not being allocated to local schools.								
1001-0001	Individual	Lucy	Morgan		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Justified	I would like to object to the Had4 - Land South of Scrub Lane proposal. My concerns are relating to welfare and safety of the children at Hadleigh infant and junior school no only during an construction will it be unsafe, loud and disruptive but 114 new homes on that small plot will be overlooking the children's playground and playing field. My son attends that school and I would not be comfortable with the school being so overlooked. Also the area is a high traffic area as it is, especially due to it's close proximity to the school and to the high street. There is already issues with traffic here due to parked cars and traffic lights. Adding	Remove Had4 - Land South of Scrub Lane proposal.	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to Had4 because: Traffic Parking Density Infrastructure	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											construction to this area would cause a lot of issues for all nearby residents and locals. In addition the local doctors and dentists are up to capacity and the schools oversubscribed. I strongly disagree with the proposal and object fully.							Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 0 0 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Daniel	Flanders		Yes	HA D4	Yes		Yes			Please do not build more houses here, its already super busy, traffic is a nightmare as is parking for the schools, plus there is a huge huge safety concern in terms of the flats looking over a school and school field of the infants school. Its putting children in a vulnerable position. There are so many other useful things that could be done with the land, please reconsider! Its a hugely overpopulated area already. Please please reconsider and do not build anymore flats or housing here.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objecting to Had4 because: Traffic Parking Overlooking Infrastructure	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Overlooking Chapter 16 - achieving well designed places will	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		ensure that enough space is provided between the dwellings and the school playing field to safeguard school children and residents. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
1005-0001	Individual	Sam	Flanders		Yes	HA D4	Yes		Yes			Hadleigh and scrub lane in particular is over populated as it is. There are far too few schools and school places available and very little parking. Traffic is terrible especially during school drop off and collection without the added flats. There is also a concern over the fact that the flats will overlook the infants school and the school field. There is more than could be done with that space rather than putting in a block of	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to Had4 because: Traffic Parking Overlooking Infrastructure	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
												flats. The area does not need any more housing.						sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Overlooking Chapter 16 - achieving well designed places will ensure that enough space is provided between the dwellings and the school playing field to safeguard school children and residents. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
1014-0001	Individual	Harry	Pyle		Yes	HAD4	No		No			This site will produce a lot more traffic on an already busy route. Also at peak times and school times, the road is often down to one way due to the number of parked cars on dropping off/ picking up times	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to HAD4 due to traffic concerns	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation.	N
0738-0007	Organisation	Roy	Warren	Sport England	Yes	HAD4	Yes		Yes		Land south of Scrub Lane (Ref: 318) was land last used as a playing field albeit many years ago. The site was allocated in the previous Local Plan that was not adopted. Sport England's position on this allocation when consulted in the past		No	Not Answered		A	Supports the development of Land South of Scrub Lane with the appropriate financial contribution towards new or enhanced playing	Support noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											was that based on the individual circumstances of the site (including the limited size of the site and the lack of ancillary facility infrastructure) the principle of development would be acceptable if mitigation could be secured in the form of an appropriate financial contribution in lieu of direct replacement playing field provision that could be used towards new or enhanced playing field provision in the Borough. This is justified due to the deficiencies identified in the Council’s Playing Pitch Strategy as the site could be brought back into use to help address these deficiencies. The requirement in part 5 of the policy (and paragraph 10.30 of the reasoned justification) for the loss of playing field land to be mitigated by an appropriate financial contribution towards new or enhanced playing fields nearby is therefore supported. This requirement is considered to be necessary to ensure that the policy accords with the Council’s evidence base (Playing Pitch Strategy) and Government policy in paragraph 104 of the NPPF.							fields within the locality.		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 0 2 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Chl oe	John s		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	The area is overpopulated already and the new flats will overlook a primary school playground.	Do not add more houses on every bit of grass you find in the area. We need more healthcare services not more residences.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Objecting to HAD4 because: New flats will overlook the primary school no houses on every piece of green field More doctors needed	Overlooking Chapter 16 - achieving well designed places will ensure that enough space is provided between the dwellings and the school playing field to safeguard school childeren and residents. Location of development The council has taken an urban first approach allocating brown and green field land for development to provide housing and safeguard development in the greenbelt. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
1025-0004	Individual	Martin	England		Yes	HA D4	No	The draft plan is not legally compliant as it fails to consider strategic alternatives, like North West Thundersley, which has been excluded, the Biodiversity and environmental protection needs strengthening, there is no credible five-year housing land supply and a lack of evidence on cross-boundary infrastructure with a duty to cooperate. The policy of not building on the Greenbelt is biased and predetermined.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified.	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Add the Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites of Kings Park HO31. Add the Greenbelt site of Land East of Manor Trading S0145 SHLAA 2018. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Benfleet at 347, Thundersley at 643, and Hadleigh at 305, keeping Existing Commitments 480, and Windfall Allowance 675. Total housing target of 11,000	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Objecting to Had4 due to: Traffic capacity on Scrub Lane Parking capacity on Scrub Lane Density out of character	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. The Had4 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic proposal for 114 homes, using the Castle Point Density and Capacity Study, and a 100dph urban guide, in a residential area of housing currently having homes at 20dph. Housing on this site at 100dph would equate to six blocks of flats, four flats per floor, and four stories high, which is out of character for the area. The statement that the frontage of the development is designed to reflect the character of Scrub Lane, is a complete fabrication, as the houses opposite relates to approx. 15dph and it will never match the current street scene. The addition of 114 homes, and over 200							Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented. Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											cars, would cause major issues at the Scrub Lane / Rectory Rod traffic lights. This resident led local plan said protect the Greenbelt and use the Brownfield sites, but the resident's responses did not say to destroy those areas like Scrub Lane with over development. This policy is the perfect reason why you need to add the North West Thundersley site as an alternative site, that gives us the housing numbers required, driven by an infrastructure first policy and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites across the borough.								
1 0 3 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Emi ly	Cox		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Effective	It will cause absolute aggravation on the roads that are already busy and congested. The school is too close to have a number of properties built in such close proximity.		No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Objecting to HAD4 because: Traffic Close proximity to the school	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Close proximity to the school Chapter 16 - achieving well designed places will ensure that enough space is provided between the dwellings and the school playing field to safeguard school children and residents.	
1 0 3 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Sap phi re	Side y		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Completely unnecessary and unacceptable putting properties facing a school. These grounds are walked through daily by the children. We do not need more housing!!!! We need more amenities - doctors, dentists. Not more overcrowding!!	Keep some grass land!! Stop making Hadleigh into a concrete jungle. It is so disappointing to see what this council is doing. Focus on green spaces!! Stop focussing on profits!!	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objecting to HAD4 because: Infrastructure Close proximity to the school	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Close proximity to the school Chapter 16 - achieving well designed places will ensure that enough space is provided between the dwellings and	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		the school playing field to safeguard school children and residents.	
1 0 5 7 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Sam	Read		Yes	HAD4	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	I don't feel the draft has considered the impact of the local residents and needs of the area. There has been no consideration regarding the traffic issue that is experienced on this road, which constantly gets busier. The houses are built so close together that there is no room for parking which in turn makes scrub lane a car park. The environmental issue of 114 houses worth of waste and sewage on the local area and the lack of green space. The school it backs on to already cannot support the number of students wishing to attend let alone having more. The document states footpaths and cycle lanes that currently don't exist, and with busier roads I don't see how they can exist.	More clarification on how they came to the number of 114 of homes and not less. The houses on this street are large with plenty of land. The number proposed will mean they are small, no land and won't fit in with the current houses. Not mentioning the lack of parking or facility for parking. The school already causes traffic issues, less space and more students will mean more traffic being funnelled in to a smaller space, this is not safe.	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to HAD4 because: Traffic No parking provision Infrastructure How did they get to 114	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Parking Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T7 which requires the EPOA Parking Guidance (Part 1 and 2) to be implemented.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Density of the site The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1059-0001	Individual	Jean	Cole		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Effective, Justified	This submission is our response in opposition to policy HAD4 as set out on page 73 of The Castle Point Plan. As retired professionals we moved to Hadleigh in May 2025, to be closer to members of our family, but also to enjoy Hadleigh, which we believe is unique in that it has a semi rural combination of open spaces, playing fields, woodlands and a high street. We believe this combination contributes towards a strong sense of community. We believe planes to be a clear case of overdevelopment and I'm realistic it will create a density of 100 dwellings per hectare in a residential area of housing. Currently having homes of 20 dwellings per hectare. Housing on this site at 100 dwellings per hectare would equate to 6 blocks of flats, four flats per floor, and four stories high, which is out of character for the area. The statement that the frontage of the development is designed to reflect the character of scrub Lane is a complete fabrication, as the house is opposite, relate to approximately 15 dwellings per hectare and will never match the current street scene.	We would support the development of such a community in the North West Thundersley area where there could be easier access to major road links and installation of utility and services.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objects to HAD4 because: Density Traffic Infrastructure Concern regarding reference to hadleigh junior school and not infants school on page 212 Proposal contradicts objective 19 due to loss of a playing field North West Thundersley	Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required							
											The addition of 114 homes and over 200 cars, would cause major issues at the scrub Lane/Rectory Road, traffic lights The plans would also cause an extra burden on the area’s General Practitioner surgery -the Hollies- as well as affecting electrical, water, gas and other services. We note that on page 212 of the plan, that the council only lists the Hadleigh Junior school as an important asset, but does not include the infants school and nursery as part of this list. This leads us to believe that the planned development is only the first phase of further plans to build on the rest of the playing field including land currently occupied by the Hadleigh Infant School. The school playing field is in daily use by school children Monday to Friday and various football clubs at the weekend. In our opinion the development further undermines objective 19 on page 18 of the plan, which states: “Secure improved health and wellbeing outcomes for residents enabling more active and healthier lifestyles, creating healthy Living environments and reducing health inequalities.”														INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Reference to Hadleigh Junior school as a locally important heritage asset on page 212 is due to the heritage aspect rather than the importance of the building as an education facility. Policy HAD4 requires suitable mitigation for the loss of the playing field facility in accordance with objective 19 North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											Physical activity has been shown be very beneficial in preventing and reducing obesity in children and also contributing towards good mental health. It also provides an environment for young people to develop their social skills, teamwork and communication. We believe that the council should be reaching out and consulting with various groups regarding how to make better use of the playing field in its current form, rather than reducing it with the planned development.							within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	
1065-0003	Not Answered	Terry	Clarke		Not Answered	HAD4	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites	Add North West Thundersley site, reduce the urban housing target by half, revise Scrub Lane development to 20 homes.	No	Not Answered		A	Objecting to HAD4 because: density	Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. The Had4 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic proposal for 114 homes, using the Castle Point Density and Capacity Study, and a 100dph urban guide, in a residential area of housing currently having homes at 20dph. Housing on this site at 100dph would equate to six blocks of flats, four flats per floor, and four stories								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											high, which is out of character for the area. The statement that the frontage of the development is designed to reflect the character of Scrub Lane, is a complete fabrication, as the houses opposite relates to approx. 15dph and it will never match the current street scene. The addition of 114 homes, and over 200 cars, would cause major issues at the Scrub Lane / Rectory Rod traffic lights. This resident led local plan said protect the Greenbelt and use the Brownfield sites, but the resident's responses did not say to destroy those areas like Scrub Lane with over development. This policy is the perfect reason why you need to add the North West Thundersley site as an alternative site, that gives us the housing numbers required, driven by an infrastructure first policy and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites across the borough.									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 0 6 6 - 0 0 0 3	Not Answered	She ila	Clar ke		Not Answ ered	HA D4	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce	Add North West Thundersley site, reduce the urban housing target by half, revise Scrub Lane development to 20 homes.	No	Not Ans wer ed			Objecting to HAD4 because: density	Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											the over development of our urban sites. The Had4 Policy is a perfect example of the over development urban policy, with an unrealistic proposal for 114 homes, using the Castle Point Density and Capacity Study, and a 100dph urban guide, in a residential area of housing currently having homes at 20dph. Housing on this site at 100dph would equate to six blocks of flats, four flats per floor, and four stories high, which is out of character for the area. The statement that the frontage of the development is designed to reflect the character of Scrub Lane, is a complete fabrication, as the houses opposite relates to approx. 15dph and it will never match the current street scene. The addition of 114 homes, and over 200 cars, would cause major issues at the Scrub Lane / Rectory Rod traffic lights. This resident led local plan said protect the Greenbelt and use the Brownfield sites, but the resident's responses did not say to destroy those areas like Scrub Lane with over development. This policy is the perfect reason why you need to add the North West Thundersley site as an alternative site, that gives us the housing numbers required, driven by									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											an infrastructure first policy and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites across the borough.								
1 0 7 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ker ry	Hall ett		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The amount of local traffic this development will create is unreasonable and not sustainable. The area is already over populated and under serviced with local amenities. Traffic is already excessive between hadleigh and leigh on sea. The polution created from this standing and constantly queueing traffic is unreasonable. Local services and doctors surgeries are over subscribed already. What was once a lovely place to live is being ruined by excessive building and a complete lack of addional local services to support this rapidly growing population.	Significant reduction in number of residences to be applied to this development.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Objecting to HAD4 because: Traffic Infrastructure Air quality	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Air Quality Air quality impacts are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal, under objective 9.1. Annual Status Reports for Castle Point can be found on the Essex Air website along with further information relating to air quality within Castle Point. Castle Point monitor nitrogen dioxide using diffusion tubes at 30 monitoring locations around the district. The main source of pollution in the Borough is road traffic	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		emissions from major roads, notably the A13, A127 and A130. The Council has not declared any Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). Generally, air pollution is low in Castle Point. Results from the monitoring points across the Borough suggest that air quality is improving.	
1 0 7 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ric har d	Rev ell		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Justified	Hadleigh is already overcrowded, with significant traffic down Scrub Lane following the development of Scrub Lane Mews. During school runs, Scrub Lane is reduced to a single lane road. There are no resources within Hadleigh for additional population. It is not appropriate to house persons with complex needs so close to schools / parks / playgrounds.	I would suggest first increasing resources within Hadleigh as well reviewing the traffic flow.	No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed	A	Objecting to HAD4: Traffic Infrastructure Location of homes for people with complex needs next to the school	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The council has a duty to provide homes for all	
1074-0001	Individual	Laura	Revell		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Positively prepared	Scrub Lane will not be able to handle the increase in traffic from 114 homes, the development at Scrub Lane Mews evidences this as there is always a bottleneck of traffic plus the school traffic causes issues. Housing “complex needs” so close to schools and the playground is also concerning. In general the infrastructure is not there to support a development of this size and it is not in keeping with homes already on Scrub Lane.		Not Answered	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Objecting to HAD4: Traffic Infrastructure Location of homes for people with complex needs next to the school	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The council has a duty to provide homes for all	
1 0 8 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Nat ash a	Ayle n		Yes	HA D4	Yes		No	Positively prepared	The infrastructure surrounding Scrub lane in particular the junction with Rectory Road and New Road cannot accommodate additional traffic this development would cause. With two schools in close proximity and already in adequate parking for safe drop off and collection of children this will also cause safety issues. The building of this development also does not fit in with the current build of Scrub Lane. The build removes green space for young children learning. The outdoor space should be utilised for exercise which promotes a healthy lifestyle. It also allows team sports to take place whether these are school sports or outside organisations. We cannot		No	Not Ans wer ed	Not Ans wer ed		Objects to HAD4 because: Density Traffic Infrastructure Proposal contradicts objective 19 due to loss of a playing field	Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											take this away from our future generation by building homes which are simply not practical to the infrastructure.							proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Policy HAD4 requires suitable mitigation for the loss of the playing field facility in accordance with objective 19	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1086-0001	Individual	Joshua	Marsh		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	I am writing to formally object to Policy Had4 as set out on page 73, paragraphs 10.27–10.31.The proposal for 114 homes is excessive and unsuitable for this location. The plan relies on a 100 dwellings per hectare (dph) urban density guide, whereas the surrounding area currently averages closer to 20dph. This would mean blocks of flats up to four storeys high, completely out of keeping with the existing character of Scrub Lane.The claim that the design would reflect the surrounding area is misleading, as the opposite side of Scrub Lane has far lower density housing, around 15dph, and the proposed development would not blend with the existing street scene.Introducing 114 homes and over 200 cars would put huge pressure on the already busy Scrub Lane/Rectory Road junction and increase strain on local services, particularly doctors’ surgeries. Additionally, pressure on local schooling and other infrastructure. Therefore, to avoid putting further pressure on the local residents, ensuring that double yellow lines are put on all local roads to avoid the 200 cars parking locally, more doctors, more schools, more dentists, more local		No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objects to HAD4 because: Traffic InfrastructureDensityProtect the trees on site	DensityThe density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further detailsTraffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation.Infr astructureInfr astructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											amenities, improved facilities (pipes /sewage). Residents have consistently supported the protection of Green Belt land and the use of brownfield sites for new housing. Nowhere did residents agree to destroy areas like Scrub Lane through inappropriate overdevelopment.I understand land will be built on but this is unsustainable and therefore should be more fitting to suit the current infrastructure - for example 4 luxury homes. It is also worth noting that there some very old trees at least 20, all oak except one, an ash, not larch which should be preserved.							Delivery Plan (IDP).Safeguarding the trees will be done so at planning application stage	
1087-0001	Individual	Lauren	Marsh		Yes	HAD4	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	am writing to formally object to Policy Had4 as set out on page 73, paragraphs 10.27–10.31. The proposal for 114 homes is excessive and unsuitable for this location. The plan relies on a 100 dwellings per hectare (dph) urban density guide, whereas the surrounding area currently averages closer to 20dph. This would mean blocks of flats up to four storeys high, completely out of keeping with the existing character of Scrub Lane. The claim that the design would reflect the surrounding area is misleading, as the opposite		No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objects to HAD4 because: Traffic Infrastructure Density Protect the trees on site	Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d						
											side of Scrub Lane has far lower density housing, around 15dph, and the proposed development would not blend with the existing street scene. Introducing 114 homes and over 200 cars would put huge pressure on the already busy Scrub Lane/Rectory Road junction and increase strain on local services, particularly doctors’ surgeries. Additionally, pressure on local schooling and other infrastructure. Therefore to avoid putting further pressure on the local residents, ensuring that double yellow lines are put on all local roads to avoid the 200 cars parking locally, more doctors, more schools, more dentists, more local amenities, improved facilities (pipes / sewage). Residents have consistently supported the protection of Green Belt land and the use of brownfield sites for new housing. Nowhere did residents agree to destroy areas like Scrub Lane through inappropriate overdevelopment. I understand land will be built on but this is unsustainable and therefore should be more fitting to suit the current infrastructure - for example 4 luxury homes.													proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Safeguarding the trees will be done so at planning application stage	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											It is also worth noting that there some very old trees at least 20, all oak except one, an ash, not larch which should be preserved.								
1088-0001	Individual	Chels ea	How ell		Yes	HAD4	No	No notice given to roads that will be affected by this housing, I.e. a lot more traffic on the road, less likely to get an appointment in the doctors surgery. Just want to make you all aware of the high impact building more houses in Hadleigh will have on traffic, school places, doctor surgery places, and the safety of this area. I moved from an area that was starting to go downhill, we chose Hadleigh because it's safe, quiet and it's a lovely area to bring my baby up in. We take walks over to the Castle and the Salvation army land and would hate to see that land go to waste by more houses being built for no reason. I'm not sure if this is the	No	Positively prepared		To not use this land, or any land in Hadleigh for housing. I moved here to be away from the busyness, and would hate for it to become like any other town where it's overrun with people and cars.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	B	Objects to HAD4 because: Traffic Infrastructure Density Don't build on salvation army land Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will	Density The density chosen for this site was informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								correct way to voice my opinion, nonetheless, I hope you take this into consideration.										also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The salvation army land is allocated green belt and is not included for development within this plan	
1 0 9 2 - 0 0 0 2	Not Answered	Un a	Kipp s		Not Answered	HAD4	Yes		No	Justified	When the field was divided in the 1990s, it was always agreed that the remaining school playingfield would have long-term vehicle access from Scrub Lane, for when the Junior School, currently between Church Road and The Avenue, would be rebuilt on the land adjacent to the Infant and Nursery school. There is no mention of retaining	Include vehicular access to the Junior School field on that site.	No	Not Answered			Objecting to HAD4 because: Keep vehicular access to the junior school from scrub lane to enable future development of the school site No infrastructure delivery Traffic	Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											vehicular access from Scrub Lane in this plan, which would inevitably reduce the number of homes which could be built on the land in question. Not to include that access precludes any future development along those lines, which is ridiculously short-sighted. And Scrub Lane cannot accommodate such increased traffic as this development proposes: at certain times of day it can take 4 or more changes of traffic lights to cross the Rectory Rd / New Rd /Scrub Lane junction. Without an Infrastructure Plan in place, the quality of life of local people will deteriorate markedly from all this intensive building.							access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient highway impact mitigation. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
1093-0001	Individual	Michaela	Green		Yes	HAD4	No		No		No more flats! Over looking an infant school	No more flats overlooking children	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Objecting to HAD4 because: No flats Overlooking School	"Traffic Capacity Any application for homes on this site will have to comply with policy T6 which ensures that development proposals offer safe access to the highway. Any proposal will also have to comply with T5 to ensure sufficient	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		highway impact mitigation. Close proximity to the school Chapter 16 - achieving well designed places will ensure that enough space is provided between the dwellings and the school playing field to safeguard school children and residents."	
1 4 3 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Da niel	Ada mson		Yes	Had 4	Yes		No	Effective	114 homes on the land off Scrub Lane is far too many and would lead to gridlock on Scrub Lane and neighbouring roads. 25 homes would be a more suitable number for this space	Reduce the number of houses to be built on this land to something like 25.	No				114 homes on the land off Scrub Lane is far too many and would lead to gridlock on Scrub Lane and neighbouring roads. 25 homes would be a more suitable number for this space	Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0319-0003	Agent	James	Chapman	Disc over y Land and Plan ning		HO U2		3. Affordable Housing Delivery Problem: The LHNA (June 2025) identifies a need for 1,458 affordable homes (86 p.a.). Policy H2 requires Affordable Housing to be calculated at 10% on Brownfield above commercial, 20% on Brownfield and 30% on Greenfield on allocations, which equates to 954 units across all allocated sites. Site C4 provides 600 of these dwellings (62% of the total projected delivery, with this site not scheduled to deliver any units in the first 10 years of the plan period. If all allocated sites deliver their affordable housing requirement in line with the trajectory outlined in the Housing Topic Paper August 2025, then delivery shall be 68 units in the first 5 year period; 241 in yrs 6-10; and, 644 units in the last seven years of the plan period. This provides just 14 units per annum in the first five years, rising to 48 units in yrs 6-10 and then 92 units in yrs 11-17. Historic Affordable Housing delivery (2011–24) was just 195 dwellings (15 p.a.), well below need.				Suggested Modifications: - Increase AH requirements where viable. - Increase number of allocated sites. - Accelerate delivery on small Council-owned or brownfield sites. - Publish an AH delivery plan with monitoring triggers if delivery falls short. Illustrative Affordable Housing Delivery vs Need: Category Units Timing Issues Identified Need (LHNA, 2025) 1,458 86 per annum required Expected Supply from Allocations (Policy H2) 954 Majority dependent on Site C4 Shortfall 504 Frontloaded delivery not secured Current projection shows the delivery of 309 units (68 + 241 = 309) in the first 10 years against a requirement of 860 (86 x 10 = 860). This means the authority is planning for a shortfall of 551 units in the first 10 years of the plan.			Yes	A	- Affordable Housing: The LHNA (June 2025) identifies a need for 1,458 AH units (86 p.a.), but allocations are expected to deliver only 954, with most Affordable Housing dependent on one single site (C4) not delivering until late in the plan period.	Noted	N
0343-000	Agent	Ben	Weedall	Glad man Dev elop men ts ltd		Hou 2	Yes	Gladman note that all proposals for new residential development resulting in 10 or more net additional homes (or 0.5 hectares or more) exceptionally permitted on	Yes							B	Support approach to Affordable Housing	Noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
04								grey belt land or otherwise within the extent of the Green Belt will provide 50% affordable housing, of which 50% will be for social rent, and 50% will be for affordable home ownership. This approach is supported in order to demonstrate that development can be brought forward that complies with the Golden Rules in accordance with Affordable Housing ensuring that the development is sustainable and is in accordance with national policy with reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF.											
0361-0003	Individual	An net te	Rou sou		Yes	HO U2	Yes	However, affordable housing is used to make people feel better about allowing development, the first buyer will never be able to own it; the second buyer will have no restriction on what they can sell it for, therefore it does not remian affordable, unless you are moving from London where homes sell at a premium. Locals will be priced out of their own area and Castle Point will end up being a mini London	Ye s			See comment on where the blood testing facilities will be in Hadleigh and Benfleet.				A	Concern regarding affordability of affordable housing	The definition of affordable housing and what can be included as affordable housing provision is set by the government through the NPPF.	N
0988-0002	Agent			Pers imm on Ho mes Ltd c/o Peg asus Gro up	Yes	HO U2	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	2.35 In addition, it is noted that Policy Hou2 only requires 10% affordable housing provision on urban sites (all affordable ownership), with a further 10% on urban sites (social rent) where no commercial development is provided. Given urban sites comprise the majority of the Council's		Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	Objects to 10% addordable housing provision on urban sites with a further 10% on urban sites (social rent) where no commercial development is provided. Questions the viability of this.	This requirement is supported by the Castle Point Plan Viability Study.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											identified supply, this would result in a maximum of 20% affordable provision arising from the current identified housing supply. Although the viability of this provision has not been justified, and is therefore questionable. Given the already poor affordable housing provision historically in Castle Point, which has led to an affordability crisis, there is no justification for further limiting opportunities for affordable housing provision.								
0 3 3 5 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Damien	Lynch	Planning Issues OBO Churchill Living and McCarthy Stone		HOU2		The draft policy sets out that all proposals for new residential development resulting in 10 or more net additional homes (or 0.5 hectares or more) will be required to deliver new affordable housing, as a proportion of the total gross housing with a minimum of 10% intermediate housing and a further 10% on brownfield sites (without ground floor commercial) or a further 20% social housing on greenfield sites. In so far as this policy would impact both McCarthy & Stone and Churchill Living, given that they deliver almost exclusively on brownfield land, the expectation is that they would be required to provide 20% affordable housing subject to viability. This is unless ground floor commercial is provided			Birmingham Due to the specific viability challenges of delivering older persons' housing, the evidence suggests on the basis of the market research, appraisal inputs and policy requirements, Older Person's Housing is exempted from Affordable Housing provision. Charnwood Our viability evidence shows that neither sheltered housing nor extra care housing developments are likely to be viable if a contribution towards affordable housing is sought. This was also the case in BCP and most recently in Hyndburn emerging local plan policies. In addition, Fareham Borough Council's adopted local plan Policy HP5 states: The Viability Study concludes that affordable	We recommend the following addition to emerging HOU2 to ensure the policy is justified, effective and is in accordance with national planning policy guidance: "The Viability Study concludes that affordable housing is not viable for older persons and specialist housing. Therefore, Policy HOU2 does not apply to specialist housing for older persons".					Recommends the following addition to emerging HOU2 to ensure the policy is justified, effective and is in accordance with national planning policy guidance: "The Viability Study concludes that affordable housing is not viable for older persons and specialist housing. Therefore, Policy HOU2 does not apply to specialist housing for older persons".	Address via an additional paragraph to Policy Hou2 as follows 6. Where these requirements cannot be met, a fully transparent viability assessment should be provided in line with Part 6 of policy SP4. The Council reserves the right to seek mitigation through the use of a late stage viability assessment linked to an overage	Y - Additional paragraph to Policy Hou2 as follows 6. Where these requirements cannot be met, a fully transparent viability assessment should be provided in line with Part 6 of policy

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
								when the requirement would reduce to 10%. It is at this point; it is important to recognise The PPG on viability at Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20190509 which states: “The role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. Viability assessment should not compromise sustainable development but should be used to ensure that policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan’ and that ‘Policy requirements, particularly for affordable housing, should be set at a level that takes account of affordable housing and infrastructure needs and allows for the planned types of sites and development to be deliverable, without the need for further viability assessment at the decision making stage”. When reviewing the Council’s recently published Viability Study (July 2025), it is clear that the older persons housing typology has been tested. The conclusions of this report are clearly set out within paragraph 6.10: The viability results for the tested older person accommodation by accommodation type and value area are summarised			housing is not viable for older persons and specialist housing. Therefore, Policy HP5 does not apply to specialist housing or older persons housing. Both McCarthy Stone and Churchill Living are of the view that a similar stance should be taken by Castle Point in the knowledge that older persons housing does not have the capacity to delivery affordable housing, as set out in the Viability Study. Council Members, Officers and the general public will assume that applications for sheltered or extra care housing will be able to support a policy compliant level of affordable housing. This would however be wholly at odds with the viability evidence underpinning the Local Plan were the assumptions made within the testing to accord with those agreed routinely on a site-specific level. Our extensive experience in dealing with site specific viability discussions is that it is never appropriate to apply generic affordable housing requirements as this leads to confusion, misled expectations and delay.								clause within the S106 Agreement, in the event that viability improves prior to the completion of the development.	SP4. The Council reserves the right to seek mitigation through the use of a late stage viability assessment linked to an overage clause within the S106 Agreement, in the event that viability improves prior to the completion of the development.

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								in Table 6.2. It is clear from these results that the older person accommodation would be unlikely to come forward under the emerging Castle Point Plan in the current market anywhere in Castle Point borough. Therefore, some flexibility in the emerging policies may be required, possibly by lowering the affordable housing rates for older person sites. Our experience of affordable housing provision elsewhere in the country is that its commonly agreed older persons' housing cannot provide full percentages of affordable housing or indeed often cannot provide for any affordable housing. The draft policy appears to ignore the recommendations of the Viability Study which would mean that the policy is not justified or in accordance with the NPPG. More and more local planning authorities are acknowledging the viability constraints of older person's housing within emerging and adopted local plans by way of exemptions. As industry leading specialists, we consider this approach to be proactive and necessary for enabling adequate delivery of this type of housing. This is particularly the case where Viability Tests show the model of older persons housing to not be viable, as											

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								is the case here. As an example, emerging policies in both Birmingham and Charnwood propose affordable housing exemptions in respect of proposals for housing for older people having found through their plan wide viability assessments that viability was constrained for these typologies. The proposed wording of each policy has been set out below:											
0343-0005	Agent	Ben	Weedall	Gladman Developments Ltd		Hou3	Yes	Gladman agree that a range of house types are required to meet local requirements and to ensure mixed and balanced communities and note that house type requirements are informed by the Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA). As stated in the policy's reasoned justification that the housing mix should also reflect the local context of the site, as it is recognised that it will not be possible to secure a full mix of house sizes and types on all sites and that consideration will be made on an individual site basis.	Yes							B	Support for Policy Hou3. Gladman agree that a range of house types are required to meet local requirements and to ensure mixed and balanced communities and note that house type requirements are informed by the Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA). Note reasoned justification caveats.	Noted	N
0678-000	Individual	Eileen	Peck		Yes	HO U3	Yes		No	Effective	My concern is about housing: It's good that the local plan acknowledges the need for housing for the elderly but I don't think it goes far enough. The fact that CP has an ageing	See 3c above	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		Lack of provision of housing for the elderly	Policy HOU4 makes provision for specialist housing, including the elderly, which	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
01											population contributes to housing shortage. Over 8,000 people in CP claim single occupancy discount on council tax, many of whom - including me - would downsize if something suitable was available in their neighbourhood. Not sheltered accommodation or a flat with no garden. Many live in large houses which could be converted into two, or sometimes three, independent living spaces. This would release family houses for families. I suggest the Council could: (1) Put out an invitation to those older people in family houses to see how many would like to look at the feasibility of converting their house (2) Seek architects who would appraise the properties as to their suitability.								has been based on the need identified in the Local Housing Needs Assessment 2023 and the Local Housing Needs Assessment Update 2025.	
0988-0003	Agent			Persimmon Homes Ltd c/o Pegasus Group	Yes	HOU3	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	3.1. The qualification in Policy Hou3 that the stated mix is an initial benchmark is supported. Various site and other factors can determine the most appropriate housing mix for a site. It should also be recognised that the LHNA on which the benchmark housing mix is based is already two years old, and needs will continue to change and evolve over the Plan period. 3.2. The proposal to split the housing mix provision between “Premium		Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	The benchmark mix would be applied on a case-by-case basis should be included within the policy wording itself, to further emphasise the flexibility of the policy.	The council considers the supporting text to be sufficient	N	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											Sustainability Areas” and “All Other Areas” is laudable, but ultimately disjointed in its reasoning. The assumption seems to be that the most sustainable and well connected sites are those located within the urban area, and so will be constrained in their ability to deliver larger homes at a higher quantum, while sites located outside of the urban area are the least sustainable. This is a broad generalisation that is not always true in practice. Take Land West of Benfleet (GB5) as an example, which is extremely well related to the urban area, with multiple opportunities for connections to existing streets and footpaths leading towards existing services, facilities (including Tarpots Town Centre) and public transport. 3.3. The supporting text reiterates that the benchmark mix would be applied on a case-by-case basis. Given the above inconsistencies in the reasoning behind the policy, it is recommended that this is drawn from the supporting text into the policy wording itself, to further emphasise the flexibility of the policy.									

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
0335-0002	Individual	Damien	Lynch	Planning Issues OBO Churchill Living and McCarthy Stone		HOU3		This policy sets out a generic housing mix against which applications for residential proposals will be benchmarked. The Castle Point Housing Needs Assessment 2025 clearly sets out that the largest growing age cohort over the plan period will be amongst older households and that within this, couples without children or single people will see the largest increase in household types.			Our view is that policy HOU3 as drafted, fails to account for the fact that specific types of residential proposals, including housing for older people will simply not need to provide the mix of housing as set out. This is clearly the case based upon the council owns housing needs evidence base. The December 2023 housing needs assessment states the following: We would note that between 2023 and 2043 the older person population of Castle Point is projected to grow by 3,527persons aged 75 years or more. As of 2023, there were 12,291 persons aged 75 years or more in Castle Point and there were 561 units of dedicated older person accommodation in the area, almost all of which is in the form of sheltered housing. This means that there are around 46 units of older person housing for every 1,000 older persons in Castle Point aged over 75 years. This is one of the lowest figures of older person accommodation per capita ORS have seen. Statistics from the Elderly Accommodation Council show 139 per 1,000 across England, while the National average is 120 per thousand. The housing requirements for older people are therefore starting from a very low base and policy should	We recommend that the following text is added to the draft policy to ensure that the policy is sufficiently flexible and effective. “The needs of specialist housing typologies will differ from generic housing and will be assessed on a case by case basis in line with identified housing need”.					We recommend that the following text is added to the draft policy to ensure that the policy HOU3 is sufficiently flexible and effective. “The needs of specialist housing typologies will differ from generic housing and will be assessed on a case by case basis in line with identified housing need”.			Additional sentence Additional sentence to HOU3 proposed To ensure mixed and balanced communities, development will be required to reflect a mix in line with the table above, as far as possible and as an initial benchmark. The needs of specialist housing typologies will differ from generic housing and will be assessed on a case by case basis in line with identified housing need	Y - Additional sentence to HOU3 proposed To ensure mixed and balanced communities, development will be required to reflect a mix in line with the table above, as far as possible and as an initial benchmark. The needs of specialist housing typologies will differ from generic housing and will be assessed on a case by

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											acknowledge this and avoid creating obstacles to the delivery of much need housing for older people. The significant housing requirements for older people is set out within draft Policy HOU4 which supports the provision of at 1,056 sheltered housing homes and 594 extra care homes over the plan period. Paragraph 13.28 of the draft plan states: It is expected that older persons housing will predominantly be 1-2 bedroom units, which reflects older people’s housing needs, and will help to release larger existing houses to meet the needs of growing families. Further flexibility must therefore be allowed within draft Policy HOU3 to ensure that it is effective.								case basis in line with identified housing need.
0941-0001	Organisation	Izzi	Henderson	Anchor Hanover Group	Yes	HOU4	Yes		No	Effective	Anchor is England’s largest provider of specialist housing and care for those in later life. We fully support setting a clear target for homes for older people, divided between retirement/sheltered, extra care and care homes. This approach aligns with national planning policy, which is clear that planning policies should reflect the need for different types of housing to meet the diverse needs of older people.	Make specific allocations for older persons’ housing, in addition to M4(2) and M4(3) standards. Allow flexibility in housing mix for older persons' housing.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Supports HOU4 but requests that it be ammended to make specific allocations for older persons’ housing through its local plan policies to meet the identified need, in addition to requiring a percentage of homes to be built to M4(2) and M4(3) standards.	Policy HOU4 makes provision for specialist housing, including the elderly, which has been based on the need identified in the Local Housing Needs Assessment 2023 and the Local Housing Needs	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required						
											We encourage Castle Point Council to make specific allocations for older persons’ housing through its local plan policies to meet the identified need, in addition to requiring a percentage of homes to be built to M4(2) and M4(3) standards. This is because accessible homes are not typically reserved for older people. When making allocations, consideration should be given to the minimum number of older persons’ homes needed on a site to ensure viability, which in Anchor’s experience is at least 65. The supporting text recognises that homes for older people will mostly be needed as one and two-bedroom properties. Anchor’s new developments typically comprise single buildings with around 70 high-quality social rent homes. Social rent homes for older people are mainly one-bedroom, as two-bedroom homes are difficult to let due to the under-occupancy charge and the predominance of single-person households. Flexibility in housing mix is therefore essential to ensure the viability and successful delivery of older persons’ housing to meet needs.													Assessment Update 2025. By requiring M4(2) and M4(3) standards we can can also provide specialist accomodation for other needs such as wheelchair accessible dwellings.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02820025	Organisation	Kevin	Frasier	Essex County Council	Yes	Hou4	Not Stated		Yes		ECC support the amendments to Policy Hou4 since the Regulation 18 consultation which align with the Essex Supported and Specialist Housing and Accommodation Needs Assessment (SSHANA, 2025)., namely: • Criteria 1a - 100% of all new homes will be built to standard M4(2) and Part 1b - 10% of all new homes will be built to standard M4(3) which supports inclusive and adaptable housing; and • Criteria 2c – requiring specialist housing to be located in areas with good access to shops and services and a placement preference for Essex residents, which supports local access for vulnerable adults. • Criteria 2d – a condition will be attached to the grant of permission giving placement preference to Essex residents. ECC notes that supported housing schemes for children in care and vulnerable adults are typically small-scale and integrated within wider developments. Due to market pressures, local access to such accommodation can be constrained, resulting in placements outside the borough. ECC therefore supports policy mechanisms that prioritise local access to supported housing, enabling		Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Supports Policy Hou4 which aligns with Essex Supported and Specialist Housing and Accommodation Needs Assessment (SSHANA 2025)	Noted	2a. Proposals that contribute towards the delivery of 1,056 retirement/ sheltered homes and 594 extra care units for older people which should have regard to the Essex Supported and Specialist Housing and Accommodation Needs Assessment (2025) and provide mixed tenure of market and affordable/social

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											children and adults to remain close to family, education, and care networks. This aligns with ECC's statutory duties under the Children Act 1989 and Care Act 2014, and supports the delivery of inclusive, community-based care.								rental over the Plan period in locations with good access to shops and services. Development proposals for extra care accommodation should refer to the ECC Extra Care Design Guide (2023) and ECC Market Position Statement in their designs.

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
02820026	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	Hou4	Not Stated		No	Effective	ECC support the amendments to Criteria 2a since the Regulation 18 consultation which align with the Essex Supported and Specialist Housing and Accommodation Needs Assessment (SSHANA, 2025)., namely: • Part 2a – reference to quantified targets for 1,056 retirement/sheltered homes and 594 extra care units for older people; However, the following concerns raised in the Regulation 18 Plan still need to be addressed, namely: • Tenure split: Policy Hou4 2a does not distinguish between market and affordable/social rent provision. The SSHANA (2025) identifies a clear need for both, and ECC recommends that the policy reflects this to ensure balanced delivery. ECC support the amendments to Policy Hou4 since the Regulation 18 consultation which align with the Essex Supported and Specialist Housing and Accommodation Needs Assessment (SSHANA, 2025)., namely: • Part 2b - reference to quantified targets for 138 residential care beds, and 139 nursing care beds; ECC welcome reference to the Essex Supported and Specialist Housing Needs Assessment 2025 in	ECC requires the following amendment to ensure it is consistent with national policy and ECC's statutory duties. Amend Part 2a to specify the market/affordable social rent tenure split for retirement and extra care housing, as evidenced in the SSHANA (2025). ECC requires the following amendment to Criteria 2b ensure it is consistent with national policy and ECC's statutory duties and to reflect the SSHANA (2025) figures. Proposals that contribute towards the delivery of 138 residential carebeds and 139 extra nursing care beds over the Plan period. ECC require the evidence base supporting this policy should also refer to the ECC Extra Care Design Guide (2023) and ECC Market Position Statement (2023).	Yes	Not Stated	Yes, ECC supplied 8 additional appendices containing various pieces of evidence	B	Supports Policy HOU4 Specialist Housing Requirements but the policy needs to distinguish between market and affordable/social rent provision in criteria 2a for HOU4 Need to reference the Supported Specialist Housing Needs Assessment (May 2025) when considering Castle Point's housing needs Supports Policy Hou4 requires clarification on term nursing care beds to align with SSHANA	An update to the SSHANA (2025) was provided in December 2025, post the Regulation 19 consultation, setting out the tenure split between market and affordable/social rent for retirement/sheltered homes and extra care units for older people The previously published SSHANA did not clearly set out the tenure split and has not been scrutinised or viability tested as part of the Plan viability assessment.. It is required that future development proposals should have regard to the tenure requirements set out in the SSHANA within their planning application	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											paragraphs 13.34, 13.37 and 13.39, although reference should also be made to the Reference should be made to the Supported and Specialist Housing Needs Assessment (May 2025) which covers people with a learning disability, including young people with learning disability/autism; Autistic people; Vulnerable young people including care leavers; Children in Care; People with mental health needs; People with a physical/sensory disability, including wheelchair users ; Victims, survivors and perpetrators of domestic abuse; Older people (65+), ; and People with lower-level needs who may not draw on adult social care from Essex County Council but have support needs that affect their housing and/or accommodation.							process. These requirements are: • Retirement /sheltered housing (1056 homes) of which 802 are market housing and 253 affordable/social housing • Extra care housing (594 homes) of which 421 homes are market housing and 173 homes are affordable/social housing Accepted wording changed from extra care beds to nursing care beds Accepted references to ECC Extra Care Design Guide (2023) and ECC Market Position Statement (2023) added Accepted and	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		referenced made to SHHANA (2025)	
0 9 0 1 - 0 0 0 1	Organisati on	Ros ann a	Tun nadi ne	Habi nteg Hou sing Asso ciati on	Yes	HO U4	Yes		Ye s		As an expert housing provider, we welcome the opportunity to comment on the development of the Castle Point local plan. Habinteg is a housing association that champions inclusion by providing and promoting accessible homes and neighbourhoods that welcome and include everyone. With over 50 years' experience in housing and disability, we manage over 3300 accessible properties across England. We believe that people are disabled by barriers in society and negative public attitudes, rather than by their own impairments. Habinteg strongly supports that the local plan includes accessibility design standards, specifically Building Regulations M4(2) and M4(3). We believe that Policy Hou4 is an exemplary policy that sets a high ambition for providing homes for older and		No t An sw ere d	Not Ans wer ed	Yes		Supports requirements set out in policy HOU4	Support noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											disabled people and avoids ambiguity. 1. All new homes will be delivered in accordance with accessibility standards as follows: a. 100% of all new homes will be built to standard M4(2); b. 10% of all new homes will be built to standard M4(3). The simple, robust language used alongside clear percentages leaves little room for doubt in the local authority's commitment to accessible and adaptable homes. The ambition is equal to the London Plan which we believe is the strongest accessible housing policy in the country. This approach not only supports inclusive communities but also reduces long-term costs which may otherwise fall to the local authority, for example, stairlift installation in an M4(2) home costs significantly less (£2,500–£4,000) than in a home built before the standards came into effect (£9,000–£10,000). The benefits of M4(2) homes are plentiful, and amongst them, new homes that meet category M4(2) will deliver:								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											• faster hospital discharges • less costly and speedier adaptations when required • reduced local government expenditure on domiciliary care packages by supporting individual independence within the home • delay or avoid moves to more expensive residential care settings • provide a better environment for ongoing independence when needs change. Mandating 10% of new homes built meet the M4(3) wheelchair user standards will generate significant social and economic value – by reducing reliance on social care, minimising accidents in the home and maximising the potential for disabled people to be economically active and take up employment. (See Habinteg’s 2023 report with London School of Economics: Living not Existing) The benefits of M4(3) homes are plentiful, and amongst them, new homes that meet category M4(3) will deliver: • For a working age wheelchair user, the benefit of living in a wheelchair user home can be valued at around £94,000 over a 10 year period.								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und? 	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											• For a later years wheelchair user household (aged 65 and over), the benefit could be around £100,000 over a 10 year period. • For a household with a child who is a wheelchair user, the benefit of living in a suitable wheelchair user home could be around £67,000 over a 10 year period. • Removes or reduces the cost of care assistance in the home • Improves confidence, independence, and self esteem • Having a secure and appropriate home enables greater social inclusion and community participation • Reduction in trips and falls in the home. Policy Hou4 is an excellent accessible housing policy. The Local Plan could play a key role in ensuring that accessible homes are delivered by requiring planning teams to track and report the number of homes approved under the M4(2) and M4(3) standards. This data will support more effective strategic planning and ensure that delivery aligns with local needs. Dwelling mix and quality for older people Considering the wide range of needs experienced by older people the Authority								

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und ?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											should ensure that the local plan stipulates a proportion of older persons housing, where newly developed, to be designed to fully wheelchair accessible standard. Habinteg also recommends referring would be developers to the recently published ‘Inclusive Housing Design Guide’ which shows how going beyond the requirements of building regulations can produce even higher quality results that includes consideration of the needs of people with sensory or cognitive impairments and neurodiverse people. Location and context of developments Disabled and older people have told Habinteg about the frustrations and limitations of living in a neighbourhood that offers poor accessibility. This can reduce the benefits gained from having an accessible home. Factors such as the accessibility of transport provision (not just location), the street scape, provision of drop kerbs, pavement parking rules and the accessibility of local shops and amenities are all important to providing places that are truly liveable which enable people go participate int their local community.									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											Consideration should therefore be given in the local plan as to how the Authority wishes to emphasise the importance of accessibility of the local neighbourhood for any new development, not just proximity.								
0 3 3 8 - 0 0 0 6	Organisati on	Cat heri ne	Bick nell	NHS Mid and Sout h Esse x		Hou 4	Yes	The ICB requested consideration be given to requiring more than 8% of new homes to be built to the M4(3) standard to allow some choice for residents in need of wheelchair user housing. The Council's Issues and Options Consultation Statement 2025 explains that all new homes will be delivered in accordance with accessibility standards as	Ye s		Policy Hou4 – Specialist Housing Requirements states that all new homes will be delivered in accordance with accessibility standards as follows: a. 100% of all new homes will be built to standard M4(2); b. 10% of all new homes will be built to standard M4(3). The supporting text explains that in order to provide both					A	Policy Hou4 – Specialist Housing Requirements states that all new homes will be delivered in accordance with accessibility standards as follows: a. 100% of all new homes will be built to standard M4(2); b. 10% of all new	Support noted	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								follows: 10% of all new homes will be built to standard M4(3) wheelchair user.			choice and resilience in the housing stock and recognising that some need will also be met through adaptations, the Plan/s requirements that 10% of all new dwellings meet M4(3) standard remains justified and deliverable. The ICB's request is addressed.						homes will be built to standard M4(3). The supporting text explains that in order to provide both choice and resilience in the housing stock and recognising that some need will also be met through adaptations, the Plan/s requirements that 10% of all new dwellings meet M4(3) standard remains justified and deliverable. The ICB's request is addressed.		
0 9 8 8 - 0 0 0 4	Agent			Pers im m on Ho mes Ltd c/o Peg asus Gro up	Yes	HO U4	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	4.1. Persimmon seeks to build homes that can be comfortable and liveable for the long term. The provision of homes built to M4(2) and M4(3) standards is therefore supported. However, this is subject to policies being sound, which in this case means the Council providing evidence that there is a need for M4(2) / M4(3) provision, and demonstrating that this provision has been appropriately accounted for in the viability assessment. 4.2. In accordance with the NPPG, any policy requirement for homes to be built to either M4(2) or M4(3) standards will need to be supported and justified by robust evidence. The requirement for M4(3) in		Yes	Not Ans wer ed	Yes	A	Objects to policy HOU4 as it lacks evidence for the M4(3) requirement.	Evidence for this requirement can be found in the Housing Needs Assessment 2023.	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											particular is not clear in its calculation. It is stated there is an existing need for 1,140 M4(3) homes in the Borough (of which some need will be met through the conversion of existing homes), which will rise by 400 units between 2023-2043. This represents 8% of the Council's Local Housing Need figure of 5,100 homes. 4.3. The above has been translated into a benchmark figure of 8% of new homes to be built to M4(3) standard. The link between need and policy requirement has not been justified.								
0823-0011	Organisation	Pat	Abbott	Environment Agency	Yes	HO U5	Yes		Yes		Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use are considered by Annex 3 of the NPPF to be “highly vulnerable” whereas sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plans are considered to be “more vulnerable”. Table 2 of the PPG for Flood risk and coastal change states that “Highly vulnerable” classes should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3a or 3b and that more vulnerable may be permitted if the Exception Test is passed and that there are adequate specific warning and evacuation plans in place.	Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use are considered by Annex 3 of the NPPF to be “highly vulnerable” whereas sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plans are considered to be “more vulnerable”. Table 2 of the PPG for Flood risk and coastal change states that “Highly vulnerable” classes should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3a or 3b and that more vulnerable may be permitted if the Exception Test is passed and that there are adequate specific warning and evacuation plans in place. Policy Hou5 proposes that	No	Not Answered		A	Concern for caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for premanent residential use within flood zone 3a. Policy Hou5 proposes that “consideration will be given as to whether a condition should be used to restrict the winter use of caravans.” Perhaps this should be reworded to read “consideration will be given as to whether a condition should be used to restrict the winter	Policy wording change noted - see proposed modifications	2. Where applications for new park homes are made, consideration will be given as to whether a condition should be used to restrict the winter use of ~~caravans~~ Parkhomes. Winter

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											Policy Hou5 proposes that “consideration will be given as to whether a condition should be used to restrict the winter use of caravans.” Perhaps this should be reworded to read “consideration will be given as to whether a condition should be used to restrict the winter use of new Park Homes” The policy should be clear that new caravans or park homes intended for permanent residential use in FZ3 are contrary to the NPPF & PPG. We believe that the key issue here is the “residential” element as opposed to “holiday” use, and that this is partly why Park Homes are considered to be “Highly Vulnerable” and inappropriate to Flood Zone 3. This is partly because of their susceptibility to significant flood damage, rendering their occupants homeless (if the Park Home is their sole residence), as opposed to occupants not being rendered homeless if their seasonal caravan/Park Home is damaged by flooding. We believe that Policy Hou5 would be more compatible with the NPPF and PPG if the policy would contain wording to make clear that new Park Homes (1) cannot be the sole residence of the occupier/owner,	“consideration will be given as to whether a condition should be used to restrict the winter use of caravans.” Perhaps this should be reworded to read “consideration will be given as to whether a condition should be used to restrict the winter use of new Park Homes” The policy should be clear that new caravans or park homes intended for permanent residential use in FZ3 are contrary to the NPPF & PPG. We believe that the key issue here is the “residential” element as opposed to “holiday” use, and that this is partly why Park Homes are considered to be “Highly Vulnerable” and inappropriate to Flood Zone 3. This is partly because of their susceptibility to significant flood damage, rendering their occupants homeless (if the Park Home is their sole residence), as opposed to occupants not being rendered homeless if their seasonal caravan/Park Home is damaged by flooding. We believe that Policy Hou5 would be more compatible with the NPPF and PPG if the policy would contain wording to make clear that new Park Homes (1) cannot be the sole residence of the occupier/owner, (2) will be for holiday/leisure					use of new Park Homes” The policy should be clear that new caravans or park homes intended for permanent residential use in FZ3 are contrary to the NPPF & PPG. We believe that Policy Hou5 would be more compatible with the NPPF and PPG if the policy would contain wording to make clear that new Park Homes (1) cannot be the sole residence of the occupier/owner, (2) will be for holiday/leisure use through the authorised season, and; (3) occupancy will be seasonally restricted to times outside of the winter months. This would align the policy aims more towards the development appropriateness guidance in Table 2 of the Flood risk and coastal change PPG and the definitions of vulnerability classifications		use will be restricted where: 13.45 To this end, the Council will seek to limit the further provision of park homes to the existing caravan sites, and where possible and necessary will restrict new park homes providing residential accommodation to ensure these are not the sole residence where the occupants are

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											(2) will be for holiday/leisure use through the authorised season, and; (3) occupancy will be seasonally restricted to times outside of the winter months. This would align the policy aims more towards the development appropriateness guidance in Table 2 of the Flood risk and coastal change PPG and the definitions of vulnerability classifications provided in Annex 3 of the NPPF which differentiate vulnerability for the use of these type of structures relative to “residential” or “holiday/short-let caravan usage.	use through the authorised season, and; (3) occupancy will be seasonally restricted to times outside of the winter months. This would align the policy aims more towards the development appropriateness guidance in Table 2 of the Flood risk and coastal change PPG and the definitions of vulnerability classifications provided in Annex 3 of the NPPF which differentiate vulnerability for the use of these type of structures relative to “residential” or “holiday/short-let caravan usage.					provided in Annex 3 of the NPPF which differentiate vulnerability for the use of these type of structures relative to “residential” or “holiday/short-let caravan usage.		likely to be at risk from flooding or the effects of cold weather. It should be noted that the siting of most park homes on the existing sites will not require new planning consent as their provision is permitted under the existing consents for the use of the site as a caravan park.
0339-00	Organisation	Sarah	Bowernan	Essex and Suffolk Water		HO U5	Not Stated	We note that the replacement of old caravans at Thorney Bay Caravan Park does not need planning consent but does contribute to housing supply. Over the Plan period it is expected that a total of 173 park	Not Stated		It is not clear whether they are obliged to conform to policy SD9, and so we would ask the council to ensure all new caravans, including those on all sites in the Borough, meet water					A	We note that the replacement of old caravans at Thorney Bay Caravan Park does not need planning	Park homes are generally exempt from UK Building Regulations	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								homes will replace existing caravans at this site.			efficiency standards set out in Policy SD9.						consent but does contribute to housing supply. Over the Plan period it is expected that a total of 173 park homes will replace existing caravans at this site. It is not clear whether they are obliged to conform to policy SD9, and so we would ask the council to ensure all new caravans, including those on all sites in the Borough, meet water efficiency standards set out in Policy SD9	(including Part G water efficiency standards) because they are considered a type of mobile, transportable dwelling. Instead of the Building Regulations , new park homes intended for permanent residential use must comply with the British Standard B S 3632 which promotes water efficiency through requirements for specific types of plumbing systems and water-using appliances, it does not use the same quantifiable	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		l/p/d target or the same regulatory framework as Part G of the Building Regulations . The Council will encourage compliance with relevant water efficiency standards as far as possible.	
03100006	Individual	Martin	England		Yes	Hou5			No	Justified, consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West		Yes	As Head of the Save the Hadleigh Farmland Group I would like to put the case forward as	No	A	Policy Hou5: Concentrations of older people increases pressure on health services but HO31 could offer a doctor's surgery as part of the S106 agreement. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding. The Hou5 Policy states, that the siting of most park homes on the existing sites will not require new planning consent as their provision is permitted under the existing consents	Park Homes and Pressures on Health Services Noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures, and there is no emergency evacuation procedure for Canvey Island. The plan needs amending as this unsound plan, for 6,200 homes, will put all Castle Point Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The plan is based on the total over development of urban sites policy across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and			to why our site is still at risk with a local plan that will be found unsound, which will then lead to speculative development across our precious Greenb			for the use of the site as a caravan park. We can fully support a policy that adds homes to the local plan, in the right place, but the Hou5 Policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the residents. The local plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different.		

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											drainage, and flooding implications. Adding the North West Thundersley site as an alternative, gives us the housing numbers required, and we can reduce the over development of our urban sites. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites, and concentrations of older people increases pressure on health services but HO31 could offer a doctor's surgery as part of the S106 agreement. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding. The Hou5 Policy states, that the siting of most park homes on the existing sites will not require new planning consent as their provision is permitted under the existing consents for the use of the site as a caravan park. We can fully support a policy that adds homes to the local plan, in the right place, but the Hou5 Policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the residents. The local plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different.			elt site s. Als o, the ove r dev elo pm ent with this pla n will cau se unt old issu es to the loc al urb an are as, whe n ther e are viab le site s avai labl e whi ch					

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														have not been seriously considered, like NW Thundersley. Also, as a Committee Member for the Friends of Canvey Lake group I would like to put the cas					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														e for war d as to why our lake is still at risk with this pla n that put s ove r thre e tho usa nds hou ses on Can vey Isla nd, but whe n fou nd uns oun d, will lea d to spe					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														cul ativ e dev elo pm ent acr oss our pre cio us Gre enb elt site s, with the add itio nal hou ses on our Gre y Belt site s on Can vey, whe n ther e are viab le site s avai labl					

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
														e whi ch hav e not bee n seri ousl y con side red, like NW Thu nde rsle y.					
0 4 9 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jan et	Mitc hell		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	
0494-0002	Individual	Deborah	Cox		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 4 9 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Dav id	Gub b		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 4 9 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sandra	Crowhurst		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 4 9 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jac kie	Hyd e		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 4 9 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joy ce	Mea dow s		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 4 9 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Dor een	Fran klin		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 0 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Car ol	Spic er		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 0 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ge org e	Whit tens		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 0 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea n	Roo ney		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 0 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Linda	Phillips		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 0 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Tho mas	Coo k		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 0 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Iris	Leo nard		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 0 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	De nni s	Huc kle		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 0 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pat	Plan t		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 0 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Juli a	Silve ster		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 1 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joh n	Leo nard		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 1 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ray	Clar ke		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 1 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joa n	Hill		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 1 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Car ole	Mal one		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 1 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mar tin	Roo ney		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 1 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bri an	Cro whu rst		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 2 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Dor oth y	Pant er		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 2 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Edit h	Oliv er		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 2 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Gle nda	Spo ner		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031site any different.Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. Allour homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the localresidents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowedHOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny BayThe 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).Kings ParkWithin the withdrawn local plan, the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 2 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	San dra	Gar dner		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 2 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Col in	Bate s		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 2 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	De e	Isbel l		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0526-0002	Individual	Anne	Cook		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 2 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Gin a	Ridg ewel l		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 3 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bar bar a	Lee		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan,	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		t and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 3 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Lyn n	Haw kes		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 3 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Chr isto phe r	Mur phy		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 3 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pa mel a	Mal ey		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 3 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea nni ne	Rho des		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 3 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	An n	God frey		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 3 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Shi rley	Hym as		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 3 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Kat hle en	Furn ell		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 3 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Gar y	Haw kes		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 4 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joy ce	Kelly		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 4 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jun e	Mal pass		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 4 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jan et	Bear d		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 4 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joy ce	Dou ghty		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 4 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea n	Pres ton		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 4 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea n	Bak er		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 4 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Shi rley	Wal sh		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		Yes			A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 4 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sus an	Phel ps		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 4 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea n	Cole		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 5 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Fra ces	Pac kha m		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 5 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sha ron	Cola yir		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 5 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jani ce	McD onn ell		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 5 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ivy	Fisher		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 5 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Car ol	Cha mbe rs		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 5 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Linda	Conlon		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 5 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Terr y	Willi ams		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 6 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Fra nce s	Ham mon d		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 6 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	She ila	Den ham		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 6 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ma ure en	Wag horn		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 6 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ric har d	May		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 6 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bre nda	Spe ncer		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 6 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bar bar a	Ben nett		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 6 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mar ilyn	Coo k		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 7 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ber nar d	Cha mbe rs		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 7 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sus an	Dillo n		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 7 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sus an	Tille y		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 7 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sha ron	Port er		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 7 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ja me s	Willi s		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 7 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ch eryl	Tayl or		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 7 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	De bbi e	Mcq uad e		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 7 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joa n	Billi ngs		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 8 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Val erie	Norr is		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 8 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ray mo nd	Billi ngs		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
0 5 8 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sid ney	Phel ps		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031site any different.Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. Allour homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the localresidents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowedHOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny BayThe 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).Kings ParkWithin the withdrawn local plan, the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0583-0002	Individual	David	Tuggey		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 8 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mo nic a	Clar k		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 8 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jan et	Bak er		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0586-0002	Individual	Sue	Byrne		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 8 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ver a	Alle n		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 8 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mar ion	Warr		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Juli e	Hutt on		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	She lley	Hull		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ale xan dra	Web ber		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0594-0002	Individual	Gillian	OConnor		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ros e	Coo k		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mic hae l	Hym as		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ronal d	Furn ell		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Haz el	Dani els		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 5 9 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ma ure en	Vale		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 0 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	An n	Eldri dge		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 0 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jen ny	McQ uad e		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0603-0002	Individual	Jenny	Lee		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 0 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Linda	Gibbs		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 0 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Keith	Bear d		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 0 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Dor een	Hun nabl e		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 0 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Syl via	Sain s		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0609-0002	Individual	Lesley	Mills		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0610-0002	Individual	Joan	Poppe		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 1 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Linda	Gibson		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0612-0002	Individual	Linda	Cooper		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 1 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Linda	Coyte		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 1 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sus an	Hint on		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0617-0002	Individual	Rose	Malpass		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 1 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea n	Dool an		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 1 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Kim	Ros e		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.					A	The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 6 2 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jun e	Mox ham		Yes	Hou 5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.						The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0622-0002	Individual	Terence	Morris		Yes	Hou5					The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		Yes				The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1025-0007	Individual	Martin	England		Yes	HO U5	No	The draft plan is not legally compliant as it fails to consider strategic alternatives, like North West Thundersley, which has been excluded, the Biodiversity and environmental protection needs strengthening, there is no credible five-year housing land supply and a lack of evidence on cross-boundary infrastructure with a duty to cooperate. The policy of not building on the Greenbelt is biased and predetermined.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy, as it doesn't meet two of the national planning policy standards, which are meeting the housing target of 11,662 for Castle Point, with 6,200 being only 53% of the target, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified as your site selection strategy is biased towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", you have not considered all sites, as Greenbelt sites under 100 homes were excluded, sites on SHLAA 2018 were ignored, using only Brownfield sites, and the exclusion of North West Thundersley undermines the claim, no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites have been added, despite a six month delay to review, a lack of evidence that our area cannot meet the high housing target, and the gap has not been robustly justified, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, and the number	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Add the Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites of Kings Park HO31. Add the Greenbelt site of Land East of Manor Trading S0145 SHLAA 2018. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Benfleet at 347, Thundersley at 643, and Hadleigh at 305, keeping Existing Commitments 480, and Windfall Allowance 675. Total housing target of 11,000	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Policy Hou5: Concentrations of older people increases pressure on health services but HO31 could offer a doctor's surgery as part of the S106 agreement	Noted.	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d	
											of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures. An unsound plan will put all Greenbelt sites at risk to speculative development and all our precious Greenbelt sites need total protection from government intervention. The policy is based on the total over development of urban sites across the borough, especially on Canvey, which was not resident led. This over development policy will affect the highways and traffic, the lack of infrastructure, sewage and drainage, and flooding implications. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites, and concentrations of older people increases pressure on health services but HO31 could offer a doctor's surgery as part of the S106 agreement. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding. The Hou5 Policy states, that the siting of most park homes on the existing sites will not require new planning consent as their provision is permitted under the existing consents for the use of the site as a caravan park. We can fully									

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											support a policy that adds homes to the local plan, in the right place, but the Hou5 Policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. The local plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different.								
1 1 0 7 - 0 0 0 1	Sue	Jac kso n				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 0 8 - 0 0 0 1	Vickey	Sta rke y				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 0 9 - 0 0 0 1	Robert	Mar tin				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 1 0 - 0 0 0 1	Andrew	Elliot				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 1 1 - 0 0 0 1	Philip	Moran				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 1 2 - 0 0 0 1	Steven	Hut ton				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 1 3 - 0 0 0 1	Maureen	Mar tin				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 1 4 - 0 0 0 1	Pauline	Jon es				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 1 5 - 0 0 0 1	Derek	Wa rre n				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 1 6 - 0 0 0 1	Sharon	Moran				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 1 7 - 0 0 0 1	Edward	Ed war ds				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 1 8 - 0 0 0 1	Robert	Jon es				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 1 9 - 0 0 0 1	William	Sho tto n				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different...Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes...Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31...Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050...Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowedHOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny BayThe 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).Kings ParkWithin the withdrawn local plan, the	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 2 0 - 0 0 0 1	Barbara	Har me r				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 2 1 - 0 0 0 1	Margaret	Brenna n				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 2 2 - 0 0 0 1	Rosemary	Gri ms ey				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 2 3 - 0 0 0 1	Ian	Grimsey				Hou5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 2 4 - 0 0 0 1	Joyce	San der s				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 2 5 - 0 0 0 1	Graham	San der s				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 2 6 - 0 0 0 1	Brenda	Tan ner				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 2 7 - 0 0 0 1	John	Tan ner				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 2 8 - 0 0 0 1	Christine	Tug gey				Hou 5	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the H031 site any different... Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites...	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes... Add the Greenbelt/Grey Belt site of Kings Park HO31... Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050... Total housing target of 11,000.					The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents	Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
																		plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward.	
1 1 2 9 - 0 0	Individual	Sim one	Cald eco urt			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 3 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pat	Moore			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 3 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Iris	Staley			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 3 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Car ol	Sim mon s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 3 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ken	Chil ds			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 3 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jan	Chil ds			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 3 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jan	Sinc lair			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 3 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ang ela	Rigg s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 3 7 -	Individual	Ed war d	How ard			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 1 3 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mar ion	Davi es			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 3 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ken net h	Gree n			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 1 4 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ric har d	Ivory			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 4 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ang ela	Ivory			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 4 2 - 0 0	Individual	Ala n	Dyer			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 4 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ang ela	Rea ding			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 4 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	She ila	Durr anc e			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 4 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ro ber t	Spic er			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 4 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	She ila	Spic er			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 4 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pat rici a	Belc her			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 4 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bre nda	Gor ham			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 4 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bar bara	Mon tgo mer y			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 5 0 -	Individual	Ro n	Row e			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 1 5 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jan	Rowe			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 5 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jan ette	Green			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 1 5 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joa n	McG illiga n			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 5 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Rog er	Web ber			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 5 5 - 0 0	Individual	Syl via	Hob day			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 5 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ro ber t	Hear d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 5 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Eliz abe th	Hear d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 5 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Cor inn e	You ng			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 5 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mar y	Robi nso n			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 6 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea n	Star buc k			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 6 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea n	Rae side			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 6 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ma ure en	Dem erin g			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 6 3 -	Individual	Dav id	Eve			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 1 6 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sa ma nth a	Ball			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 6 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jac que line	Mos edal e			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 1 6 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Iren e	Mitc hell			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 6 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pet er	Davi s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 6 8 - 0 0	Individual	Eile en	Davi s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 6 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Hel en	Wrig ht			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 7 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Der ek	Cha mpi on			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 7 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Har ry	Pag e			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 7 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Syl via	Pag e			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 7 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Lili an	Eniff er			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 7 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Lin da	Carr oll			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 7 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	An dy	Carr oll			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 7 6 -	Individual	Rus sell	Aubi n			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 1 7 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Car ole	Aubi n			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 7 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ken net h	Hall			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 1 7 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pat rici a	Cant well			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 8 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ber nar d	Lewi n			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 8 1 - 0 0	Individual	Mic hae l	Hill man			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 8 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Cliv e	Sch ooli ng			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 8 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Vict or	Whe lan			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 8 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea net te	Size r			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 8 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Juli e	Tith erad ge			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 8 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mr B	Hod gson			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 8 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mrs B	Hod gson			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 8 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pau line	Odd y			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 8 9 -	Individual	Jan et	Burt on			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 1 9 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Car ol	Char les			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 9 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mel vyn	Jarvi s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 1 9 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	San dra	Jarvi s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 9 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Dav id	Cant y			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 9 4 - 0 0	Individual	Ste phe n	Edg ewo rth			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 1 9 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bar bar a	Wat ers			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 9 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Nor ma n	Neil d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 1 9 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jill	Watts			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 9 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Malcolm	Dyer			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 1 9 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Roger	Laker			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 0 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ed war d	Chil ds			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 0 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Dav id	Jone s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 0 2 -	Individual	Joh n	Mog ford			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 2 0 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bar bar a	Radl ey			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 0 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Da phn e	McQ uad e			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 2 0 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Dav id	Whit e			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 0 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bri an	Nor man			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 0 7 - 0 0	Individual	Mar y	Dru mm ond			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 0 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Chr is	Silve ster			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 0 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Chr isti ne	Lock woo d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 2 1 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mar k	Lock woo d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 1 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	He ath er	Sha ckle ton			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 1 1 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Kar en	Lang wort h			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 1 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	An ne	Rou d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 1 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mar gar et	Whit e			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 1 5 -	Individual	Ken net h	Cart er			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 2 1 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Dor oth y	Cart er			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 1 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Eun ice	Saw yer			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 2 1 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mat the w	Lind say			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 1 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sus an	Lind say			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 2 0 - 0 0	Individual	Jan et	Nor man			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 2 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ken net h	Shei lds			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 2 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sus an	Web b			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 2 2 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ma ggi e	Web b			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 2 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Dal e	Gow ler			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 2 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ken	Hear d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 2 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Car ol	Hear d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 2 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Terr y	Caw s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 2 8 -	Individual	Ray mond	Bak er			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 2 2 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mr A	Oliv er			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 3 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mrs P	Oliv er			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 2 3 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jac que line	Hou nso me			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 3 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sus an	Ree d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 3 3 - 0 0	Individual	Da niel	Davi es			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 3 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ja me s	Mon tgo mer y			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 3 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Chr isti ne	Pay ne			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 2 3 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bar bar a	Hed ges			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 3 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joh n	Pott s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 3 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sue	Cam eron			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 3 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ste ve	Cliff ord			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 4 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ang ela	Harr is			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 4 1 -	Individual	Terr y	Hill			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid ence sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 2 4 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ro ber t	Haw kins			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 4 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mr K	Cha ndle r			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 2 4 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	De n	Cha ndle r			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 4 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Tho ma s	New ton			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 4 6 - 0 0	Individual	Mic hae l	Rog ers			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 4 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Col in	Byw ater			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 4 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ste ve	Ellis			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 2 4 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jill	Ellis			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 5 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Col in	ODo nova n			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 5 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Phil om ena	Odo nova n			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 5 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ana sta sia	Pow er			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 5 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bri an	Tho mas			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 5 4 -	Individual	Ed win a	Ford			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 2 5 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Lin da	Clay don			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 5 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pa mel a	Warr en			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 2 5 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joh n	Hill			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 5 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sus an	Laur ie			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 5 9 - 0 0	Individual	Eric	Burn ham			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 6 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jani ce	Daw kins			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 6 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea n	Hag ger			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 2 6 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pat rici a	Ruff			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 6 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mar ilyn	Helli car			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 6 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jac kie	Bro wn			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 6 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pet er	Hosi er			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 6 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pau l	Scot t			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 6 7 -	Individual	Gw end a	Gatr ell			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 2 6 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jun e	Hoo per			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 6 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ter esa	Barv ick			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 2 7 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Tho ma s	McC lena gha n			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 7 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Nor ma	Reis			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 7 2 - 0 0	Individual	Ste ven	Low e			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 7 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ant hon y	Smit h			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 7 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	The res a	Gra nt			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 2 7 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Kim	Raw ling			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 7 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Rog er	Sain s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 7 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Lin da	Teb b			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 7 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pet er	Ree d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 7 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ala n	Pric e			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 8 0 -	Individual	Les ley	Tayl or			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 2 8 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jea n	Davi es			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 8 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bar bar a	Letc h			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 2 8 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Da wn	You ng			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 8 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ray mond	OCa llagh an			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 8 5 - 0 0	Individual	Joan	OCa llagh an			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 8 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joh n	Ham mon d			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 8 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mr A J	Tayl or			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 2 8 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Mrs A J	Tayl or			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 8 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ani ta	She an			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 9 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Joh n	She an			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 9 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Alb ert	Leat ham			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 9 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ste phe n	Fox			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 9 3 -	Individual	Syl via	Fox			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 0 2								states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.										to the sites environment	
1 2 9 4 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Lin da	Free man			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 9 5 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ja me s	Gray			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								environment for the local residents.											
1 2 9 6 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Ant hon y	John son			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 9 7 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Pat rick	Gar dine r			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 2 9 8 - 0 0	Individual	Joan	McCulloch			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 2								of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 2 9 9 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Eile en	Jane s			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 0 0 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Sus an	Bass			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 0 1 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Chr isti ne	Eagl esto ne			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 0 2 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Jun e	Mar ster son			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 0 3 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Bri an	Mar ster son			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1 3 0 8 - 0 0 0 2	Individual	Michae l	Ford		Yes	Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 0 9 - 0 0 0 3	Individual	Kay	Pum frey			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 1 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	L	Wes t			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
											environment for the local residents.								
1 3 1 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Dor oth y	Pant er			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 1 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Vic key	Star key			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 1 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ala n	Wes t			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 1 4 - 0	Individual	Gra ha m	Tith erad ge			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
0 0 1											from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.							to the sites environment	
1 3 1 5 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Mrs J	Tith erad ge			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 1 6 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Val erie	Haw kins			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 1 7 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Joh n	Haw kins			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 1 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Leo nar a	Mall ake			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 1 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Jan et	Alm ond			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 2 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	M	Glov er			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 2 1 - 0 0	Individual	J	Glov er			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
01											development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1322-0001	Individual	Reg	Baker			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1323-0001	Individual	Christine	Bentham			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1324-0001	Individual	Irene	Sambrook			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1325	Individual	Julie	Hicks			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 1											are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.						environment for the local residents	improvement to the sites environment	
1 3 2 6 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Brian	Hicks			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 2 7 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Sharon	Porter			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 2 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Shelley	Hull			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 2 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Terr y	Wild man			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 3 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Bre nda	Tan ner			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 3 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Mrs L	Coyt e			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 3 2 - 0 0	Individual	S	Byrn e			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
01											development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1333-0001	Individual	S	Clarke			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1334-0001	Individual	Pam	Malley			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1335-0001	Individual	James	Williams			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1336	Individual	Julie	Hutton			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 1											are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.						environment for the local residents	improvement to the sites environment	
1 3 3 7 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Joy ce	Dou ghty			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 3 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ste ve	Hutt on			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 3 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Jan et	Mitc hell			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 4 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ivy	Fisher			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 4 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	D	Huckle			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 4 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Larry	Coyte			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 4 3 - 0 0	Individual	Beryl	Stewart			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
01											development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1344-0001	Individual	Tracy	Dufosse			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1345-0001	Individual	Linda	Cooper			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1346-0001	Individual	Christopher	Murphy			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1347	Individual	Marie	Stephenson			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 1											are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.						environment for the local residents	improvement to the sites environment	
1 3 4 8 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	J	Milt on			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 4 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	D	Tugg ey			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 5 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Joy	Bak er			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 5 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	J	Mal pass			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 5 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Mrs V M	Alle n			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 5 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Jun e	Mox hay			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 5 4 - 0 0	Individual	Mar tin	Engli sh			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
01											development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1355-0001	Individual	Doreen	Hunnabe			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1356-0001	Individual	Julie	Cashman			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1357-0001	Individual	Ian	Grimsey			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1358	Individual	Linda	Conlon			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 1											are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.						environment for the local residents	improvement to the sites environment	
1 3 5 9 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Fra nci s	Ham mon d			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 6 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Jea n	Cole			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 6 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	S	Rab ey			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 6 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Chr isti ne	Le- May			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 6 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Lin da	Godl ey			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 6 4 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	We ndy	Edw ards			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 6 5 - 0 0	Individual	Jan e	Gri mm er			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
01											development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1366-0001	Individual	Norman	Warn			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1367-0001	Individual	Patricia	Carewell			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1368-0001	Individual	Steven	Tilley			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1369	Individual	Terry	Wood			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 1											are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.						environment for the local residents	improvement to the sites environment	
1 3 7 0 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Sus an	Tille y			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 7 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Bar bar a	Har mer			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 7 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ma ure en	Vale			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
1 3 7 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Pat rici a	Bak er			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 7 4 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Mo nic a	Clar k			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 7 5 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Ros em ary	Gri mse y			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 7 6 - 0 0	Individual	Jan et	Dina line			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
01											development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1377-0001	Individual	Sharon	Moran			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1378-0001	Individual	Philip	Moran			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1379-0001	Individual	Ann	Eldridge			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1380	Individual	Mrs V	Norris			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
- 0 0 0 1											are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.						environment for the local residents	improvement to the sites environment	
1 3 8 1 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Mrs F	Pac kha m			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 8 2 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Joh n	Tan ner			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1 3 8 3 - 0 0 0 1	Individual	Jan et	Bak er			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual /Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1384-0001	Individual	S	Dillon			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1424-0003	Individual	Sheila	Clifford		Yes	Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.						Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
0284-0005	Organisation	Emma	Goodings	Brentwood Borough Council	Not Stated	Hou6	Yes	The Council supports CPBC’s approach to meeting identified needs for additional Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. BBC would like to emphasise the need for continued close and effective working on Gypsy and Traveller accommodation across Essex, through the EPOA and other strategic planning groups. Furthermore, it is important for CPBC to continue to engage with the ongoing EPOA programme of work to identify the need for a transit site within Essex, with any outcomes of this	Yes						No	A	Supports policy for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation	CPBC agrees to work with South Essex Authorities on Gypsy and Traveler accommodation and with EPOA to identify a transit site within Essex	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								work factored into reviews of the CPLP.											
0 2 7 4 - 0 0 0 2	Organisati on	Kit	Wel ch	Chel msf ord City Cou ncil	Not State d	Hou 6	Yes	CCC welcomes the full provision of the required Gypsy and Traveller Sites within the administrative boundary of CPBC.	Ye s				Not Sta ted		No	A	CCC welcomes the full provision of the required Gypsy and Traveller Sites within the administrative boundary of CPBC.	Noted	N
0 2 8 2 - 0 0 2 7	Organisati on	Kev in	Fras er	Esse x Cou nty Cou ncil	Yes	Hou 6	Not Sta ted		Ye s		ECC supports the approach to meeting identified needs for additional Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. Ongoing collaborative work on Gypsy and Traveller accommodation across Essex, through the EPOA and other strategic planning groups is recommended. Furthermore, it is important for the borough to continue to engage with the ongoing EPOA programme of work to identify the need for a transit site within Essex, with any outcomes of this work factored into reviews of the Plan.		Yes	Not Stat ed	Yes, EC C sup plie d 8 addi ton al app endi ces con taini ng vari ous piec es of evid enc e	B	EEC supports approach to meeting Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation in Castle Point	Noted. CPBC will continue to collaborate with neighbouring authorities through EPOA to identify the need for a transit site.	
0 2 8 3 - 0 0 0 4	Organisati on	Em ma	Goo ding s	Roc hfor d Distr ict Cou ncil	Not State d	Hou 6	Yes	Policy Hou6: The Council supports CPBC's approach to meeting identified needs for additional Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. RDC would like to emphasise the need for continued close and effective working on Gypsy and Traveller	Ye s				Not Sta ted		No	A	Supports CP's policies on Gypsy and Traveler Sites. Refers to need to work across South Essex to identify a transit site.	Noted agreed	N

I D R e f	Individual /Organisa tion/Agen t?	Firs t Na me	Last Na me	If orga nisa tion - nam e	Has agree d to publi cation of Name /Com ment s?	Poli cy/ Par a No.	2a. Leg ally Co mp lian t?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So un d?	3b. Positive/Effe ctive/Justifie d/Consisten t?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in exa m	6. Wh y?	Sup port ing Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
								accommodation across Essex, through the EPOA and other strategic planning groups. Furthermore, it is important for CPBC to continue to engage with the ongoing EPOA programme of work to identify the need for a transit site within Essex, with any outcomes of this work factored into reviews of the CPLP.											