



Regulation 19 Consultation Spreadsheet
Representations and Responses to the Castle Point Plan
Ordered by policy number SP3

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
0346-0001	Individual	Christine	Rands				SP3					For the attention of: CPBC Planning department Policy reference/name: SP3 / C4 Page number: 25-26 / 40-41 Paragraph number: 6.32-6.35 / 8.33-8.40 Dear Sir/Madam, This is my own personal response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation. I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply. I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness, justified and 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					A	Objections on: • 5 Year housing supply - Not identified as required under NPPF 78. • Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution. • North West Thundersley should have been included. • SA - NW Thundersley not adequately assessed. • Canvey: Concerns over flood risk. SUDS must be designed with a full understanding of Canvey's unique drainage context. • Green Belt: Welcome decision not to include green belt sites. • Charfleets: Objects to inclusion of residential and lack of engagement,	• Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. • Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground • Strategic Alternatives: Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred (also see 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. • Flooding and infrastructure covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. 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 also have been considered through the 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		Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 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										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										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 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 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 businesses											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required				
										integrated with residential homes. The access roads onto Canvey Island are not sufficient at the present time. A further road(s) must be a priority in order to even consider further housing on the Island. Most of the roads around the Island are also not standard width which causes problems navigating the area. Consideration as to how the Island's roads would cope with the copious amount of building traffic that would need to access the Island would need to be a further priority. 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. Note, I															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												do not wish to participate at the oral examination. I am happy that my name will be published alongside my comments to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 consultation. Please acknowledge receipt of my submission. Kind regards Christine Rands 14 Chapman Road Canvey Island SS8 7QS									
0351-0001	Individual	Jade	Day			SP3	No	Dear Sir/Madam, I DO NOT support the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft Consultation. I DO NOT consider the draft plan to be legally compliant. Reason: It fails to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. It has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, consistent with national policy	I DO NOT consider the draft plan to be sound. Reason: 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	PROPOSED MODIFICATION: Add North West Thundersley site.				A	Objections on: • 5 Year housing supply - Not identified as required under NPPF 78. • Duty to Cooperate - Absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution. • North West Thundersley should have been included. • Canvey: Concerns over flood risk. SUDS must be designed with a full understanding of Canvey's unique drainage context. • Green Belt: Welcome decision not to	• Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. • Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground • North West Thundersley : Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred (also see 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. • Flooding and infrastructure covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												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. The 3,316+ urban homes for Canvey is not resident led					include green belt sites.	design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options also have been considered through the the SFRA.		Assessment (SFRA).	
0643-0001	Organisation	Robert	Spink	King John's Wood Landowners Consortium	Yes	SP3	No	The Draft LP does not comply with the LDS. It does not comply with the NPPF, particularly in identifying current GB land which is not meeting the GB functions and is previously developed. It does not provide the mandatory Standard number of dwellings. CPBC has not	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy		It does not comply with the NPPF, particularly in identifying current GB land which is not meeting the GB functions and is previously developed and therefore could and should be released to provide much needed homes and to take a fairer share of the region's housing need. It does not provide the mandatory Standard number of dwellings. It fails to provide economic activity and the homes needed in the borough. It fails to set out the	The previous Lp which was found sound but not adopted by the council should be used as the basis for the new LP. This would assist in making the new LP sound.	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Does not meet the standard method housing target Does not release any GreenBelt regardless of if it meets GreenBelt function tests or not Dwelling mix relies too heavily on flats	Standard Method Housing Target 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 deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. More information on this can be found in the Housing Topic Paper. 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 considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development.	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. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								worked sufficiently collaboratively with neighbouring authorities .			correct mix of dwellings, relying too much on flats.						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 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. Dwelling Mix An update to the Local Housing Needs Assessment, Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment and a Specialist and Supporting Housing Assessment (prepared by Essex County Council) has informed policies within the Castle Point Plan to ensure a mix of housing types are delivered for our future residents. This includes ensuring the needs of our ageing population and those unable to afford to buy a home are met.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0275-0001	Organisation	Joe	May	Leigh Town Council	Not Stated	SP3	Not Stated	The following comments regarding the Castle Point Plan have been agreed by Leigh-on-Sea Town Council's Planning, Licensing and Environment Committee on Tuesday 9th September 2025: We write further to our letter of 18 September 2024 and your subsequent response. Previously Leigh-on-Sea Town Council expressed strong objection to the Salvation Army land in Hadleigh being allocated for development. Whilst we acknowledge the fact that the latest	Not Stated					Not Stated		No	B - see 0275-0003	<u>Salvation Army land in Hadleigh</u> Leigh-on-Sea Town Council is concerned that the Salvation Army land in Hadleigh is vulnerable to being developed, whilst acknowledging that it has not been allocated for development. Castle Point Borough Council has not met the targets for housing set by Government, the vulnerability is clear despite Green Belt policy. If such an application comes forward Leigh-on-Sea Town Council will seek to object in the strongest possible terms for all the previously rehearsed reasons and we would be grateful if, therefore, you would keep our correspondence on file to be laid before your members. <u>Bus Enhancements</u> The Town Council is pleased to see the enhancement of the bus services between Hadleigh and	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
								iteration of the Local Plan does not allocate this land for development we remain concerned at its now evident vulnerability and there is no preclusion to the landowner/ developer making a planning application in advance of the adoption of the Local Plan. Should they do so, given that non-inclusion will not have been endorsed by an Inspector and that Castle Point Borough Council has not met the targets for housing set by Government, the vulnerability											Leigh-on-Sea which we very much hope will lead to less congestion and traffic movements.					

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							y is clear despite Green Belt policy. If such an application comes forward Leigh-on-Sea Town Council will seek to object in the strongest possible terms for all the previously rehearsed reasons and we would be grateful if, therefore, you would keep our correspondence on file to be laid before your members. Alternatively, given the Salvation Army's previous position we anticipate that they or a developer will seek to promote the land through the Local Plan EIP process, possibly running alongside														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

any planning application . Our objections would be equally relevant to such a scenario and we would ask again that you keep them on record for the Inspector to take them into account. We would be grateful if you would take these comments into account before deciding whether to confirm that allocation. The Town Council is pleased to see the enhancement of the bus services between Hadleigh and Leigh-on-Sea which we very much hope will lead to less

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								congestion and traffic movements.															
0793-0001	Individual	Maria	Cooper	N/A	Yes	SP3	No	Re: Castle Point Plan – Regulation 19 Draft (July 2025) – Objection I write as a resident of Canvey Island to make representations in objection to aspects of the Castle Point Plan (Regulation 19 draft, July 2025). While I appreciate the effort that has gone into preparing this Plan, I believe that certain proposals (especially those affecting Canvey Island) are unsound, insufficiently justified and pose serious risks to local communities, infrastructure, environment and quality of life. I urge that these matters be revisited and amended before the Plan is submitted for examination. Below are my specific objections and requests.	No	Consistent with national policy	Re: Castle Point Plan – Regulation 19 Draft (July 2025) – Objection I write as a resident of Canvey Island to make representations in objection to aspects of the Castle Point Plan (Regulation 19 draft, July 2025). While I appreciate the effort that has gone into preparing this Plan, I believe that certain proposals (especially those affecting Canvey Island) are unsound, insufficiently justified and pose serious risks to local communities, infrastructure, environment and quality of life. I urge that these matters be revisited and amended before the Plan is submitted for examination. Below are my specific objections and requests.	Re: Castle Point Plan – Regulation 19 Draft (July 2025) – Objection I write as a resident of Canvey Island to make representations in objection to aspects of the Castle Point Plan (Regulation 19 draft, July 2025). While I appreciate the effort that has gone into preparing this Plan, I believe that certain proposals (especially those affecting Canvey Island) are unsound, insufficiently justified and pose serious risks to local communities, infrastructure, environment and quality of life. I urge that these matters be revisited and amended before the Plan is submitted for examination. Below are my specific objections	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Infrastructure Transport Third Road onto Canvey Flood Risk on Canvey Green/Grey belt Alternative sites	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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. 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	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
							ly justified and pose serious risks to local communities, infrastructure, environment and quality of life. I urge that these matters be revisited and amended before the Plan is submitted for examination. Below are my specific objections and requests. 1. Over-allocation of homes in Canvey Island, given infrastructure vulnerability • The Plan proposes to allocate over 3,300 homes on Canvey Island. Such scale					and requests. 1. Over-allocation of homes in Canvey Island, given infrastructure vulnerability • The Plan proposes to allocate over 3,300 homes on Canvey Island. Such scale of development risks placing unsustainable pressure on already stretched infrastructure (roads, sewage, flood protection, health, schools, etc.). • In particular, I note that Canvey Island has significant infrastructure vulnerabilities. The Plan’s evidence base does not convincingly show how the cumulative impacts of this level of housing will be mitigated to avoid severe harm. • Without firm and funded commitments to improving key infrastructure (transport links, drainage/flood defences, capacity of utilities and services), such housing allocation could lead to deterioration of							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 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. 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 management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4, SD1, SD2 and SD3 of 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	
								of development risks placing unsustainable pressure on already stretched infrastructure (roads, sewage, flood protection, health, schools, etc.). • In particular, I note that Canvey Island has significant infrastructure vulnerabilities. The Plan’s evidence base does not convincingly show how the cumulative impacts of this level of housing will be mitigated to avoid severe harm. • Without firm and funded commitments to improving key infrastructure					living conditions for existing and new residents. 2. Transport, highways and accessibility concerns • Access from Canvey Island / developments may further exacerbate congestion, especially at major junctions, and the Plan lacks clarity or certainty on how road and traffic impacts will be managed. • Evidence supplied so far appears weak in demonstrating how additional vehicle movements will be accommodated without severe negative effects. • Particularly, any reliance on accessing the A127 / A130 (or use of congested local roads) must be justified, with robust modelling and mitigation. 3. Flood risk and environmental constraints • Canvey Island, being low-lying and with existing flood risk, may not be a suitable location for large scale development unless flood risk is fully addressed.	services), such housing allocation could lead to deterioration of living conditions for existing and new residents. 2. Transport, highways and accessibility concerns • Access from Canvey Island / developments may further exacerbate congestion, especially at major junctions, and the Plan lacks clarity or certainty on how road and traffic impacts will be managed. • Evidence supplied so far appears weak in demonstrating how additional vehicle movements will be accommodated without severe negative effects. • Particularly, any reliance on accessing the A127 / A130 (or use of congested local roads) must be justified, with robust modelling and mitigation. 3. Flood risk and environmental constraints • Canvey Island, being low-lying and with existing flood risk, may not								plan, and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. 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, 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 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
								ure (transport links, drainage/flood defences, capacity of utilities and services), such housing allocation could lead to deterioration of living conditions for existing and new residents. 2. Transport, highways and accessibility concerns • Access from Canvey Island / developments may further exacerbate congestion, especially at major junctions, and the Plan lacks clarity or certainty on how road and traffic impacts will be managed. • Evidence				The Plan's flood risk assessments should be very carefully scrutinised, and appropriate mitigation required (including sustainable drainage, green infrastructure, etc.). • Also, environmental assets, green/open spaces, biodiversity, and Green Belt/grey belt protections must be respected. Any encroachment on such areas should only occur after full assessment and only if no reasonable alternative exists. 4. Green Belt / Grey Belt / Urban Capacity • The Plan claims to avoid Green Belt development and to focus on urban capacity.  • However, given the number of houses proposed in Canvey, there is concern whether urban capacity alone is sufficient, and whether some sites already considered might have unacceptable impacts. • If the Council is to rely on urban sites,	be a suitable location for large scale development unless flood risk is fully addressed. The Plan's flood risk assessments should be very carefully scrutinised, and appropriate mitigation required (including sustainable drainage, green infrastructure, etc.). • Also, environmental assets, green/open spaces, biodiversity, and Green Belt/grey belt protections must be respected. Any encroachment on such areas should only occur after full assessment and only if no reasonable alternative exists. 4. Green Belt / Grey Belt / Urban Capacity • The Plan claims to avoid Green Belt development and to focus on urban capacity.  • However, given the number of houses proposed in Canvey, there is concern whether urban capacity alone is sufficient, and whether some								Alternative Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								supplied so far appears weak in demonstrating how additional vehicle movements will be accommodated without severe negative effects. - Particularly, any reliance on accessing the A127 / A130 (or use of congested local roads) must be justified, with robust modelling and mitigation. 3. Flood risk and environmental constraints - Canvey Island, being low-lying and with existing flood risk, may not be a suitable location for large scale				these must be deliverable, accessible, sustainable, and not cause unacceptable adverse effects (traffic, services, amenities, character etc.). 5. Lack of clarity on delivery, timing and funding of mitigation - The Plan identifies infrastructure costs of tens of millions. For example, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan estimates ~£63m excluding transport in some instances. ² - But the Plan does not clearly set out how or when these mitigations will be funded, delivered, monitored. Without such certainty, there is risk that development proceeds ahead of needed infrastructure improvements. - Also, there is risk that the viability of housing delivery, especially mixed use/town centre regeneration, may be compromised without financial support/regeneration on funding. ² 6. Soundness and	sites already considered might have unacceptable impacts. - If the Council is to rely on urban sites, these must be deliverable, accessible, sustainable, and not cause unacceptable adverse effects (traffic, services, amenities, character etc.). 5. Lack of clarity on delivery, timing and funding of mitigation - The Plan identifies infrastructure costs of tens of millions. For example, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan estimates ~£63m excluding transport in some instances. ² - But the Plan does not clearly set out how or when these mitigations will be funded, delivered, monitored. Without such certainty, there is risk that development proceeds ahead of needed infrastructure improvements. - Also, there is risk that the viability of housing delivery, especially mixed										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 unless flood risk is fully addressed. The Plan's flood risk assessments should be very carefully scrutinised, and appropriate mitigation required (including sustainable drainage, green infrastructure, etc.). • Also, environmental assets, green/open spaces, biodiversity, and Green Belt/grey belt protections must be respected. Any encroachment on such areas should only occur after full assessment and only if no reasonable alternative exists.				compliance with national policy • The Plan must satisfy the tests of soundness under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024), especially: a) Positively prepared — meeting objectively assessed need where possible; b) Justified — having considered reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence; c) Effective — being deliverable in the Plan period; d) Consistent with national policy — especially in relation to flood risk, Green Belt protection, infrastructure and habitat protection. • I submit that the proposals for Canvey fail on several of these: the evidence for infrastructure mitigation is not sufficiently detailed; reasonable alternatives (lower housing densities, redirecting growth to less vulnerable areas) have not been fully explored; and risks (flood, congestion) may make parts of the	use/town centre regeneration, may be compromised without financial support/regeneration funding. ☒ 6. Soundness and compliance with national policy • The Plan must satisfy the tests of soundness under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024), especially: a) Positively prepared — meeting objectively assessed need where possible; b) Justified — having considered reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence; c) Effective — being deliverable in the Plan period; d) Consistent with national policy — especially in relation to flood risk, Green Belt protection, infrastructure and habitat protection. • I submit that the proposals for Canvey fail on several of these: the evidence for infrastructure mitigation is not sufficiently detailed; reasonable											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 / Grey Belt / Urban Capacity • The Plan claims to avoid Green Belt development and to focus on urban capacity. • However, given the number of houses proposed in Canvey, there is concern whether urban capacity alone is sufficient, and whether some sites already considered might have unacceptable impacts. • If the Council is to rely on urban sites, these must be deliverable , accessible, sustainable , and not cause unacceptable adverse effects					strategy ineffective or harmful. 7. Equality / Health / Community Impacts • The Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) accompanying the Plan is welcome in intention. But for Canvey, many of the negative impacts fall disproportionately on vulnerable groups (older people, low income households, people with health vulnerabilities) due to existing deficits in access to healthcare, etc. • Also, increased demand on public services (e.g. schools, health, social care) without matching improvements may reduce quality or availability. Conclusion and Requests Given these objections, I request that the Council: 1. Reconsider the scale of housing proposed for Canvey Island, reducing to a level that infrastructure can support	alternatives (lower housing densities, redirecting growth to less vulnerable areas) have not been fully explored; and risks (flood, congestion) may make parts of the strategy ineffective or harmful. 7. Equality / Health / Community Impacts • The Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) accompanying the Plan is welcome in intention. But for Canvey, many of the negative impacts fall disproportionately on vulnerable groups (older people, low income households, people with health vulnerabilities) due to existing deficits in access to healthcare, etc. • Also, increased demand on public services (e.g. schools, health, social care) without matching improvements may reduce quality or availability. Conclusion and Requests														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							(traffic, services, amenities, character etc.). 5. Lack of clarity on delivery, timing and funding of mitigation • The Plan identifies infrastructure costs of tens of millions. For example, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan estimates ~£63m excluding transport in some instances. • But the Plan does not clearly set out how or when these mitigations will be funded, delivered, monitored. Without such certainty, there is risk that development proceeds					without risk of severe harm. 2. Provide clearer, costed, and time-bound commitments for critical infrastructure mitigation (transport, flood protection, drainage, wastewater, health, etc.) before allocating further development. 3. Undertake further assessment of alternative sites or lower density options, particularly avoiding high risk / high cost sites (flood-prone, difficult access). 4. Ensure that delivery plans (funding, phasing) are explicit, transparent and enforceable, so that development does not outpace essential services. 5. Strengthen monitoring and accountability mechanisms, so that residents can see whether mitigation promises are being met. 6. Ensure that any development respects the environmental constraints of Canvey Island, preserves	Given these objections, I request that the Council: 1. Reconsider the scale of housing proposed for Canvey Island, reducing to a level that infrastructure can support without risk of severe harm. 2. Provide clearer, costed, and time-bound commitments for critical infrastructure mitigation (transport, flood protection, drainage, wastewater, health, etc.) before allocating further development. 3. Undertake further assessment of alternative sites or lower density options, particularly avoiding high risk / high cost sites (flood-prone, difficult access). 4. Ensure that delivery plans (funding, phasing) are explicit, transparent and enforceable, so that development does not outpace essential services. 5. Strengthen monitoring and accountability								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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							
								ahead of needed infrastructure improvements. • Also, there is risk that the viability of housing delivery, especially mixed use/town centre regeneration, may be compromised without financial support/regeneration funding.				green/open spaces, protects biodiversity, and manages flood risk in line with best practice and national policy.  I trust the Council will take these concerns seriously in finalising the Plan. I am willing to meet or provide further evidence in support of these objections. Please confirm that this representation will be officially considered at examination. 	mechanisms, so that residents can see whether mitigation promises are being met. 6. Ensure that any development respects the environmental constraints of Canvey Island, preserves green/open spaces, protects biodiversity, and manages flood risk in line with best practice and national policy.  I trust the Council will take these concerns seriously in finalising the Plan. I am willing to meet or provide further evidence in support of these objections. Please confirm that this representation will be officially considered at examination. 																	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

assessed need where possible;
b) Justified — having considered reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence;
c) Effective — being deliverable in the Plan period;
d) Consistent with national policy — especially in relation to flood risk, Green Belt protection, infrastructure and habitat protection.
• I submit that the proposals for Canvey fail on several of these: the evidence for infrastructure mitigation is not sufficiently detailed; reasonable alternative

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

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
							3M I trust the Council will take these concerns seriously in finalising the Plan. I am willing to meet or provide further evidence in support of these objections. Please confirm that this representation will be officially considered at examination. 3M														
0341-0004	Organisation	Janet	Nuttall	Natural England		SP3	Yes	6.47 A Habitats Regulations Assessment will be required for windfall sites on Canvey Island at application stage in order to demonstrate no adverse effects on site integrity –	Yes						A	6.47 A Habitats Regulations Assessment will be required for windfall sites on Canvey Island at application stage in order to demonstrate no adverse effects on site integrity – we consider that this could be worded more clearly as	<u>Modification to supporting paragraph</u> 6.47 A Habitats Regulations Assessment will be required for windfall sites on Canvey Island at application stage in order to and will need to demonstrate no adverse effects on site integrity before development can be granted permission. Same modifications to the following paragraphs: 8.16, 8.26, 8.40, 8.72, 8.78, 9.23,	<u>Modification to supporting paragraph</u> 6.47 A Habitats Regulations Assessment will be required for windfall sites on Canvey Island at application stage in order 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
								we consider that this could be worded more clearly as follows: 'A Habitats Regulations Assessment will be required for windfall sites on Canvey Island at application stage and will need to in order to demonstrate no adverse effects on site integrity before development can be granted permission'. We advise replacing the former sentence with this wording wherever it occurs throughout the document under different locations.									follows: 'A Habitats Regulations Assessment will be required for windfall sites on Canvey Island at application stage and will need to in order to demonstrate no adverse effects on site integrity before development can be granted permission '. We advise replacing the former sentence with this wording wherever it occurs throughout the document under different locations.	11.17, 13.46,14.28, 14.49, 17.8, 17.26, 18.16, 19.56, 20.30, 20.40 and 21.32 as set out in the Schedule of Modifications and the Natural England 'Statement of Common Ground'.		and will need to demonstrate no adverse effects on site integrity before development can be granted permission. Same modifications to the following paragraphs: 8.16, 8.26, 8.40, 8.72, 8.78, 9.23, 11.17, 13.46,14.28, 14.49, 17.8, 17.26, 18.16, 19.56, 20.30, 20.40 and 21.32		
0362 -	Individual	John	Nicholls		Yes	SP3	No	There is no infrastructure to be in	No	Positively Prepared							There is no infrastructure to be in place to	Infrastructure matters 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
0001								place to build 3,100 homes on Canvey Island. No 3RD road on and off the island							build 3,100 homes on Canvey Island. No 3RD road on and off the island		Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).		
0382-0001	Individual	Chris	Prentice		Yes	SP3	Yes	I fully support consultation with local residents and think council should be commended for creating a proposal that aims to satisfy the desires of existing residents. I fully support the urban first approach and except existing "Brown Field" sites to be redeveloped and that green field (or grey field) sites should be left as they are. I think there is a need to create nice affordable properties, and more social housing and agree	Yes						A	I fully support consultation with local residents and think council should be commended for creating a proposal that aims to satisfy the desires of existing residents. I fully support the urban first approach and except existing "Brown Field" sites to be redeveloped and that green field (or grey field) sites should be left as they are. I think there is a need to create nice affordable properties, and more social housing and agree with a housing mix that favours smaller properties and denser developments. I agree with Local Housing Needs Assessment versus standard methodology. Building 255+ homes a year is significantly greater than 99 homes built	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
								with a housing mix that favours smaller properties and denser developments. I agree with Local Housing Needs Assessment versus standard methodology. Building 255+ homes a year is significantly greater than 99 homes built during each of the last 10 years.											during each of the last 10 years.					
0383-0001	Individual	June	Taylor		Yes	SP3		BY HAND TO; CASTLE POINT BOROUGH COUNCIL I am attaching this letter to the Booklet provided to make comments to Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft document. I request that you note my comments and											o Castle Point faces serious challenges, including surface water flooding, infrastructure strain and pressure to accommodate growth. o The proposed allocation of the vast number of homes to Canvey Island is excessive given its environmental, Tidal Flood Risk, Hazardous Industries and infrastructure constraints. o The Council's	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity		Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								objections in connection with the above mentioned draft plan. The key points I wish to raise in this response regarding the draft plan are: o Castle Point faces serious challenges, including surface water flooding, infrastructure strain and pressure to accommodate growth. o The proposed allocation of the vast number of homes to Canvey Island is excessive given its environmental, Tidal Flood Risk, Hazardous Industries and infrastructure constraints . o The Council's										removal of several Green Belt sites is commendable and reflects strong community engagement. o North West Thundersley offers a sustainable and strategic location for growth and should be included in the Plan to better protect Green Belt sites and enable a considerable decrease in proposed housing numbers on Canvey Island. o The plan lacks a demonstrable five-year housing land supply, critically undermining its credibility and resilience.	Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to 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
									Compliance of the Plan: 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															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

soundness and compliance, and these must be addressed before submission for examination. The above are not academic concerns; they are the legal safeguards that ensure development is sustainable, justified, and in the public interest. Soundness of the Plan To be found sound at examination: the Castle Point Local Plan must satisfy the four statutory tests of soundness as defined in paragraph 35 of the NPPF. These are, positively prepared, justified, effective,

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								meetings held but find it difficult to discuss and receive answers in regard to evidence based queries I raise.																
0384-0001	Individual	Pamela	McCarthy		Yes	SP3		BY HAND TO; CASTLE POINT BOROUGH COUNCIL I am attaching this letter to the Booklet provided to make comments to Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft document. I request that you note my comments and objections in connection with the above mentioned draft plan.											o Castle Point faces serious challenges, including surface water flooding, infrastructure strain and pressure to accommodate growth. o The proposed allocation of the vast number of homes to Canvey Island is excessive given its environmental, Tidal Flood Risk, Hazardous Industries and infrastructure constraints. o The Council's removal of several Green Belt sites is commendable and reflects strong community engagement.	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply.		Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	o North West Thundersley offers a sustainable and strategic location for growth and should be included in the Plan to better protect Green Belt sites and enable a considerable decrease in proposed housing numbers on Canvey Island. o The plan lacks a demonstrable five-year housing land supply, critically undermining its credibility and resilience.		<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 preferred. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey.		

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

on the Island going to be safe in any flood or catastrophic incident. The Plan should be creating an extra highway access for the Borough onto the wider road network. I acknowledge that, the Council's approach to engagement has been constructive and but find the Regulation 19 consultation difficult to engage with due to its length and complexity. I have attempted to answer all the questions in the consultation, and would like this letter treated as my main response, as it is 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. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								concerned that the Plan does not meet these tests. There is absolutely no doubt that the housing target for Castle Point imposed centrally by the Government is impossible to meet. It would in fact be impossible for our Borough to cope with a number of houses anywhere near that target without losing its character and causing critical failure of the local infrastructure residents rely on every day. However, in order to successfully argue its case for a lower housing															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0385-0001	Individual	Lukas	Burru			Yes	SP3	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 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. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No			A	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0386-0001	Individual	Delia	Searle		Yes	SP3	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.					A	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0387-0001	Individual	Bernard	Searle			Yes	SP3	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 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.				A	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0388-0001	Individual	Tracy	Searle		Yes	SP3	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.					A	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0389-0001	Individual	Harvey	Burrow			Yes	SP3	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 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.				A	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0390-0001	Individual	Stacy	Sibthorpe		Yes	SP3	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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0391-0001	Individual	Perry	Hall			Yes	SP3	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 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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0392-0001	Individual	Dave	Wahs		Yes	SP3	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.					A	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0393-0001	Individual	Terence	Salter			Yes	SP3	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 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. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0393-0003	Individual	Terence	Salter		Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Effective, Consistent with national policy							No five year housing land supply North west thundersley was not considered	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 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	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
																			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 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
04-0001	Individual	Janet	Parish			Yes	SP3	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, as 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. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
04-0001	Individual	Lesley	Thompson		Yes	SP3	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, as 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	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.	No				Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

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
										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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
04-0001	Individual	Janice	Barnes			Yes	SP3	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, as 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. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0405-0001	Individual	Nicola	Turpin		Yes	SP3	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, as 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	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.	No				Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0406-0001	Individual	Carol	Turpin			Yes	SP3	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, as 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. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0407-0001	Individual	Deirdre	Perry		Yes	SP3	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, as 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	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.	No				Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
04-0001	Individual	Trevor	Higgins			Yes	SP3	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, as 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. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No			A	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0409-0001	Individual	Betty	Higgins		Yes	SP3	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, as 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	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.	No			A	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0410-0001	Individual	Margaret	Bowden			Yes	SP3	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, as 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 "noGreenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", hasnot considered all sites, with no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of theNorth West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directedaway from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for CanveyIsland's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	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.	No				Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point.Site selection ignores Greenbelt/ Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines.The draft local plan is notjustified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbeltbuild policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of Brownfield sites".Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with theexclusion 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.	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing deliveryCastle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0468-0002	Individual	Philip	Bournes			Yes	SP3	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 development						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
														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.							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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0469-0001	Individual	Colby	Cunningham			Yes	SP3	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 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. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050.					Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0470-0001	Individual	Cheryl	Ray		Yes	SP3	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.		No				Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0481-0001	Individual	Brett	Stone		Yes	SP3	No	No building should be started on housing until adequate infrastructure for said development has been completed	No	Positively Prepared, Justified	I don't think local need is that great. We will just help solve another areas problem, thus increasing our own over time.	Scrap it			All	A	No building should be started on housing until adequate infrastructure for said development has been completed ie new seage works, schools / collages, flood	<u>Housing Need</u> Approach to Housing Need set out the Housing Topic Paper. <u>Infrastructure</u> Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). <u>Flooding</u>	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
								ie new seage works, schools / collages, flood mitigation, doctor surgery, roads, parking. I do not think Canvey Island is suitable for any new developments until at least one more road on and off is completed. We also need to keep some areas untouched by developers for wildlife, the enviroment and peoples sanity and wellbeing.									mitigation, doctor surgery, roads, parking. I do not think Canvey Island is suitable for any new developments until at least one more road on and off is completed. We also need to keep some areas untouched by developers for wildlife, the enviroment and peoples sanity and wellbeing. I don't think local need is that great. We will just help solve another areas problem, thus increasing our own over time.		Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).			
0482 - 0001	Individual	Kim	Stone		Yes	SP3	No	Infrastructure - Canvey Island is a flood plain. The Flood Risk Area 3a is officially considered a Flood Plain in the sense	No	Not Stated	Infrastructure and services totally inadequate		Needs to be scraped				A	Infrastructure - Canvey Island is a flood plain. The Flood Risk Area 3a is officially considered a Flood Plain in the sense required by LUC Planning and Enviromental Policy. Much of Canvey lies nearly 2 metres below		Flooding and infrastructure covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to 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
								required by LUC Planning and Environmental Policy. Much of Canvey lies nearly 2 metres below the daily high tide level of the Thames Estuary. Our drainage is inadequate . By building many more homes the Island cannot sustain the parking, the roads, the jobs, the services ie)Doctors, Dentists, Schools. One more road access to and from the Island is needed. There is at present over 40,000 people living on the Island, with more housing comes more vehicles.									the daily high tide level of the Thames Estuary. Our drainage is inadequate. By building many more homes the Island cannot sustain the parking, the roads, the jobs, the services ie)Doctors, Dentists, Schools. One more road access to and from the Island is needed. There is at present over 40,000 people living on the Island, with more housing comes more vehicles. There is already a job shortage, many youngsters failing to seek employment and you will be adding more. Our doctors and dental surgeries cannot cope with the volume of people at present. As all of the above states Canveys needs, unless the infrastrcutre is sorted the current plan is unsound and does not meet the required legal requirements and is unsafe.					

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0485-0001	Individual	Teresa	Goodman			Yes	SP3	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 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. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050.	No				Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	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 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
																		and drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0486-0001	Individual	Lorraine	Buckley		Yes	SP3	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.	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.	No				Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.		Assessment (SFRA).		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0487-0001	Individual	Graham	Thomas			Yes	SP3	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 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. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050.					Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			
0488-0001	Individual	Gillian	Boucheau		Yes	SP3	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.	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.					Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u>	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.						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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.		Assessment (SFRA).		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0492-0001	Individual	Janet	Mitchell			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0494-0001	Individual	Deborah	Cox			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0495-0001	Individual	David	Gubb			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0496-0001	Individual	Sandra	Crowhurst			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0497-0001	Individual	Jackie	Hyde			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0498-0001	Individual	Joyce	Meadows			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0499-0001	Individual	Doreen	Franklin			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0500-0001	Individual	Carol	Spicer			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0501-0001	Individual	George	Whittens			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
													approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0502-0001	Individual	Jean	Rooney			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0503-0001	Individual	Linda	Phillips			Yes	SP3	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 NorthWest Thundersley, and H031.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 evacuationprocedures.There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site optionfor 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sitesNo Green/Grey Belt sites consideredCanvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLSThe 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 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 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. Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is in the Greenbelt. For those reasons set out in the Housing	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
										has serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.										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 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). Green/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; 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						projects identified in the Local Transport 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
0504-0001	Individual	Thomas	Cook			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0505-0001	Individual	Iris	Leonard		Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0507-0001	Individual	Dennis	Huckle			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.											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 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). 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, 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0508-0001	Individual	Pat	Plant			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0509-0001	Individual	Julia	Silvester			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0511-0001	Individual	John	Leonard			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0512-0001	Individual	Ray	Clarke			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0513-0001	Individual	Joan	Hill			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					</

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0516-0001	Individual	Carole	Malone			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0518-0001	Individual	Martin	Rooney			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0519-0001	Individual	Brian	Crowhurst			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0520-0001	Individual	Dorothy	Panter			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.		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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0521-0001	Individual	Edith	Oliver			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0522-0001	Individual	Glen	Spooner			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0523-0001	Individual	Sandra	Gardner			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0524-0001	Individual	Colin	Bates			Yes	SP3	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 NorthWest Thundersley, and H031.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 evacuationprocedures.There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site optionfor 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sitesNo Green/Grey Belt sites consideredCanvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLSThe 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 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 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. Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is in the Greenbelt. For those reasons set out in the Housing	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
										has serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.										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 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). Green/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; 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

projects identified in the
Local Transport 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
0525-0001	Individual	Dee	Isbell			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0526-0001	Individual	Anne	Cook			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0528-0001	Individual	Gina	Ridgewell			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0530-0001	Individual	Barbara	Lee			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 calculate the	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
										approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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. 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 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). Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments 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
																					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 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			

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
																					above. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0531-0001	Individual	Lynn	Hawkes			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0532-0001	Individual	Christopher	Murphy		Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0533-0001	Individual	Pamela	Maley			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0534-0001	Individual	Jeannine	Rhodes			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0536-0001	Individual	Ann	Godfrey			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0537-0001	Individual	Shirley	Hymas			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0538-0001	Individual	Kathleen	Furnell			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0539-0001	Individual	Gary	Hawkes			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0540-0001	Individual	Joyce	Kelly			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0541-0001	Individual	June	Malpas			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.		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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0542-0001	Individual	Janet	Beard			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0543-0001	Individual	Joyce	Doughty			Yes	SP3	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 NorthWest Thundersley, and H031.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 evacuationprocedures.There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site optionfor 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sitesNo Green/Grey Belt sites consideredCanvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLSThe 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 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 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. Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is in the Greenbelt. For those reasons set out in the Housing	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
											has serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.										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 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). Green/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; 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	

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 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.Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

projects identified in the Local Transport 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
0544-0001	Individual	Jean	Preston			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0545-0001	Individual	Jean	Baker			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0547-0001	Individual	Shirley	Walsh			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.		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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			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.		
0547-0004	Individual	Shirley	Walsh		Yes	SP3	Not stated		Not stated		I have great concerns about the amount of new properties being proposed to be built on Canvey Island coupled with the lack of support for the well being for the people who live on Canvey now by the Castlepoint Councillors. They seem to have an agenda of their own regarding this issue and it certainly is not for the good of the people of Canvey.	I understand that the Blinking Owl site North West Thundersley is up for grabs. This would allow for 5,000 homes to be built including 20-25% affordable houses. The landowners are all totally agreeing to sell this land. It would also mean a new road would be a huge benefit to Canvey & Benfleet area which Dame Rebecca Harris would rush to	Yes			None	I have great concerns about the amount of new properties being proposed to be built on Canvey Island coupled with the lack of support for the well being for the people who live on Canvey now by the Castlepoint Councillors. They seem to have an agenda of their own regarding this issue and it certainly is not for	Flooding and infrastructure covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to 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
														The whole infrastructure on Canvey at this moment in time cannot handle what is happening now let alone how it would cope with 3000+ new homes being built. What are they proposing to cater adequately for the problems we are all facing now. 1. Gridlocked Roads Each & Everyday 2. Sewerage, Drainage 3. Evacuation of people off the island to safety (see also point 1) 4. Easier access for all the “Emergency Services” at any time of day to get to where they are needed urgently 5. Road maintenance 6. Doctors, Dentists, Other Health Care Needs 7. Schools, Pre-Schools 8. Policing – Crime (is growing by the day) 9. Upkeep and maintenance of public areas 10. We need far more security cameras & speed cameras installed around the Island now and this has never happened despite the rise in	Parliament & fight the cause and that Essex County Council are on board with and would agree to. In addition to all this future homes after the 5000 for first phase could also be built on the same land if required. Coupled with all the above private builders (local people & companies would get employment which is badly needed. In my book that is a win-win situation all round so why is Castlepoint Council not on board with this ideal scenario and persist in even considering building on Canvey with all its existing issues and facts of why Canvey Island cannot sustain 3000+ homes being built.					the good of the people of 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
														crime, drug dealers and masked kids on electric scooters, anti-social behaviour rife in many areas on the island. All of the above are just some of the main reasons we can pay for a fact that our infrastructure cannot cope now. I dread to think what will happen with 3000+ more homes being built on Canvey. With 6000+ more cars & people adding to the chaos. Which brings me back to the beginning of this letter. What is the hidden agenda of the Castle Point Councillors when the “Blinking Owl Site” proposal would not affect everybody's lives badly in Canvey Island – Benfleet 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
0548-0001	Individual	Susan	Phelps			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0549-0001	Individual	Jean	Cole			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0550-0001	Individual	Fraces	Packham			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0551-0001	Individual	Sharon	Colayir		Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0552-0001	Individual	Janice	McDonnell			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0554-0001	Individual	Ivy	Fisher			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.		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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						
																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															</

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0555-0001	Individual	Carol	Chambers			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0557-0001	Individual	Linda	Conlon			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0559-0001	Individual	Terry	Williams			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0560-0001	Individual	Frances	Hammond			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0561-0001	Individual	Sheila	Denham			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0562-0001	Individual	Mureen	Waghorn			Yes	SP3	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 NorthWest Thundersley, and H031.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 evacuationprocedures.There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site optionfor 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sitesNo Green/Grey Belt sites consideredCanvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLSThe 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 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 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. Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is in the Greenbelt. For those reasons set out in the Housing	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
										has serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.										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 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). Green/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; 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

projects identified in the
Local Transport 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
0563-0001	Individual	Richard	May			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0567-0001	Individual	Brenda	Spencer			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0568-0001	Individual	Barbara	Bennett			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0569-0001	Individual	Marilyn	Cook			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0571-0001	Individual	Bernard	Chambers			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0572-0001	Individual	Susan	Dillon			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0573-0001	Individual	Susan	Tilley			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0574-0001	Individual	Sharon	Porter			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0575-0001	Individual	James	Willis			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0576-0001	Individual	Cheryl	Taylor			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											</

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0577-0001	Individual	Debbie	McQuade			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0578-0001	Individual	Joan	Billings			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0580-0001	Individual	Valerie	Norris			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.		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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0581-0001	Individual	Raymond	Billings			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0582-0001	Individual	Sidney	Phelps			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
																									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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0583-0001	Individual	David	Tuggey			Yes	SP3	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 NorthWest Thundersley, and H031.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 evacuationprocedures.There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site optionfor 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sitesNo Green/Grey Belt sites consideredCanvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLSThe 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 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 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. Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is in the Greenbelt. For those reasons set out in the Housing	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
										has serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.										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 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). Green/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; 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

projects identified in the Local Transport 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
0584-0001	Individual	Monica	Clark			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0585-0001	Individual	Janet	Baker			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0586-0001	Individual	Sue	Byrne			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0587-0001	Individual	Vera	Allen			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0589-0001	Individual	Mario	Warr			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0590-0001	Individual	Julie	Hutton			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0591-0001	Individual	Shell	Hull			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.			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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0592-0001	Individual	Alexandra	Webber			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0594-0001	Individual	Gillian	OConnor			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.			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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0595-0001	Individual	Rose	Cook			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0596-0001	Individual	Michael	Hymas			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0597-0001	Individual	Ronald	Furnell			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.			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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0598-0001	Individual	Hazel	Daniels			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0599-0001	Individual	Mureen	Vale			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0600-0001	Individual	Ann	Eldridge			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0601-0001	Individual	Jenny	McQuade			Yes	SP3	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 NorthWest Thundersley, and H031.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 evacuationprocedures.There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site optionfor 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sitesNo Green/Grey Belt sites consideredCanvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLSThe 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 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 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. Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is in the Greenbelt. For those reasons set out in the Housing	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
										has serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.										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 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). Green/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; 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	

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 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.Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

projects identified in the
Local Transport 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
0603-0001	Individual	Jenny	Lee			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0604-0001	Individual	Linda	Gibbs			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0605-0001	Individual	Keith	Beard			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0607-0001	Individual	Doreen	Hunnabale			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0608-0001	Individual	Sylvia	Sainsbury			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0609-0001	Individual	Lesley	Mills			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0610-0001	Individual	Joan	Pope			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.			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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																				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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0611-0001	Individual	Linda	Gibson			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0612-0001	Individual	Linda	Cooper			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0613-0001	Individual	Linda	Coyte			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0614-0001	Individual	Susan	Hinton			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0617-0001	Individual	Rose	Malpas			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0618-0001	Individual	Jean	Doolan			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												</

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0619-0001	Individual	Kim	Rose			Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes			A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0620-0001	Individual	June	Moxham		Yes	SP3	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, and H031. 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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7 500 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.	Yes				No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sites No Green/Grey Belt sites considered Canvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLS 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 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 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.	Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is 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
											approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.									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 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). 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0622-0001	Individual	Terence	Morris			Yes	SP3	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 NorthWest Thundersley, and H031.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 evacuationprocedures.There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site optionfor 7 500 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.				A	No 5YHLS and failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.Not consistent with national policy and is predetermined to towards no greenbelt Over development of brownfield sitesNo Green/Grey Belt sites consideredCanvey west homes put Canvey East homes at risk with emergency evacuation procedures Need for a third road to be included in the plan.	5YHLSThe 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 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 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. Strategic alternatives North west Thundersley is in the Greenbelt. For those reasons set out in the Housing	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
										has serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.										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 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). Green/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; 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			projects identified in the Local Transport Plan.			
0623-0001	Individual	Philip	Chilvers		Yes	SP3	No	3000+ houses on Canvey just isn't sustainable , the infrastructure isn't there and it is the biggest flood plane in the area	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	You can't dump all the house on one small Island it isn't feasible		Not to build 3000 houses on Canvey and to find a large empty brown site with good transport links and build a brand new mini town	No	Not Answered		A	Too many houses on Canvey Build a new town with good transport links instead	Comments noted All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).		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
0624-0001	Individual	Mary	Bimson			Yes	SP3	No	It's not treating us equally like the rest of Castlepoint	No	Justified		We have no room for 3000 houses, we flood with a small amount of rain, traffic is unbearable and dangerous in rush hour, the answer is not to suggest more buses and put cycle lanes in, there is more room in the rest of Castlepoint example manor trading estate in benfleet.	More houses put in the rest of Castlepoint and less in Canvey who can't support them.	No	Not Answered		A	Flood Risk on Canvey Bad traffic on Canvey Put Houses on Manor Trading Estates	Flood Risk 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 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. Traffic on 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex	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
																			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. Manor Trading Estate Policy B8 allocates Manor Trading Estate as part of the Castle Point Plan.		
0624-0003	Individual	Mary	Bimson		Yes	SP3	No	Plan states our bad the traffic is and their only answer is to find ways to get us out of our cars!! No !	No	Justified	It's got no justification, anyone can see Canvey cannot take this amount of building but the rest of Castlepoint can !!	Build elsewhere in castlepoint where there is more room and infrastructure	Yes	Not Answered		A	Don't build on Canvey, build in the rest of the Borough instead.	All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).		N	
0624-0004	Individual	Mary	Bimson		Yes	SP3	No	Canvey will become a carpark and lose all of its charm, there will b3 nowhere to breath	No	Justified	Canvey is being used as a dumping ground to save the rest of Castlepoint	Put the houses in the places of Castlepoint where they can take it, people who wrote the plan do not care about canvey they luv3 in the rest of Castlepoint.	No	Not Answered		A	Don't build on Canvey, build in the rest of the Borough instead.	All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).		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
0627-0001	Individual	Brooke	Woodberry			Yes	SP3	No	1. Flood Risk and Planning Law Canvey Island is a high-risk flood zone—much of the island lies below sea level and is protected by sea defences. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires: A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for all developments in flood zones. The Sequential Test to demonstrate that there are no reasonably available sites with a lower risk of flooding. The Exception	No	Effective, Justified	Canvey hasn't been thought off compared to other areas where there is more room and infrastructure cause canvey hasn't good that and if there is an emergency or floods again like it did in 2014 where are the cemetery the coffins started to come e out of the ground cause of how much water it there and the fact that it takes most people hours to get home cause it all goes onto waterside roundabout		Yes	People need to say some that this isn't okay and if you dont lue of canvey you can't see the impact Please note: It is the Inspector that will determine the most appropriate way to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the	Not Answered		Canvey Island’s development faces legal and practical risks due to its high flood vulnerability, environmental protections, infrastructure strain, and planning constraints. Housing proposals must comply with flood risk tests, environmental laws, and infrastructure planning duties. Non-compliance or misrepresentation can trigger judicial review, enforcement action, or liability claims. Also Policy Policy SD2 - Non-Tidal Flood Risk Management directs growth away from areas of highest flood risk, unless robust mitigation and national tests (Sequential and Exception) are satisfied. • Requires site-specific Flood Risk Assessments and alignment with the Level 2 SFRA (July 2025).	Policy C10 – Other Housing Site Allocations on Canvey Island This policy allocates residential sites across Canvey and directly engages with flood risk concerns. Responds to the objection: • Flood Risk Compliance: All sites sites must comply with the Sequential Test and, where applicable, the Exception Test, in line with the NPPF 2024. It references the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), which includes site-specific flood mitigation requirements.		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
							Test, showing that the development is safe and provides wider sustainability benefits. ⚠ Legal risk: If housing is approved without proper compliance, it could be subject to judicial review or future liability if flooding damages property. --- ◇ 2. Environmental Law More development could impact: SSSIs (Sites of Special Scientific Interest) Habitats Regulations if							oral examination.							

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

prone areas)

Roads, schools, healthcare

Local authorities must show that adequate infrastructure is planned under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Localism Act 2011.

◇ 4. Local Plan and Judicial Review

The Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan governs housing development. If new developments are inconsistent with the adopted plan, residents or interest

[illegible]

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0632-0001	Individual	Simon	Fitzgerald			Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The infrastructure of the whole island is not prepared for this size of development. Before any building works start there should be appropriate infrastructure already completed this includes additional roadways especially leading off and onto the island, medical facilities, schools and business opportunities to ensure a safe, climate friendly development is established to help Canvey and its residents thrive along with surrounding areas. If this is not completed then the plan is doomed to failure in a catastrophic way.	This plan would basically increase the population of Canvey Island by >25%. It needs to be completely changed and replaced.	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		Infrastructure needs to be provided before any housing Third road onto Canvey needed	Infrastructure The Castle Point Plan is accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This identifies all the infrastructure needed to support the proposed growth. Infrastructure will be delivered at different times depending on when it is most appropriate to provide it. For example, access improvements may be delivered during the early phase of a development. A school meanwhile may not be opened until there is enough children to make the revenue costs of running the school sustainable. Sometimes, financial contributions from two or more developments may be needed to provide a particular piece of infrastructure. This may mean the infrastructure is delivered when the last site is coming forward for development. 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	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
																			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 make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan.		
0633-0001	Individual	Steve	Wood		Yes	SP3	No	3300 homes on Canvey is ridiculous. I do not believe for one minute that the people who are supposed to represent us fought for us. There is some form of corruption going on that favours the “mainland” at our expense.	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	As above. The whole thing is [REDACTED] and the people who decided on this is clearly [REDACTED]. Up to and including those at a national level.	There has been zero openness or consultation with the public.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	No public consultation or openness with the public	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		
0634-0001	Individual	Megan	Boniwell		Yes	SP3	No		No	Positively prepared	On behalf of myself and most residents of Canvey Island we are extremely worried about new development plans over population the Island	A serious think onto what benefits the island	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	B	Over population of the Island	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
0635-0001	Individual	Paul	Dawes			Yes	SP3	No	Sounds very complicated	No	Positively prepared	Over development on Canvey Island, no mention of additional infrastructure eg 3rd road off Canvey Island.	Scale back on 3000+ housing and build a 3rd access road to Canvey Island.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered			Need a third road on to 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 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.		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
0636-0001	Individual	Joanne	Yalcin			Yes	SP3	No		Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	The building of more homes on Canvey island, would be a disaster. I believe that for the island only a certain amount of houses per hectares are permitted. I think the amount suggested goes well over the amount recommended. There would also be a significant increase of vehicles on the road and no planned improvements to roads or a 3rd road off, which does not exit from the same roundabout as the existing 2 routes. On a normal day there is a lot of traffic, adding to this is dangerous. When an accident happens on one road the whole island is gridlocked, and it causes roads onto and off the island to be at a standstill. If there was ever an emergency at either one of the two COMAH sites, the island would grind to a halt, and that would put thousands of lives at risk. Doctors and dentists are already full, so where	I believe where the housing goes needs to be looked at. Canvey cannot cope with that amount of housing. Infrastructure can't cope, drainage systems can't cope, Doctors can't cope, schools can't cope. The amount of houses per hectare needs looking at.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Canvey Island cannot take the amount of homes proposed lack of infrastructure Safety due to COMAH and evacuation concerns Flood risk concerns	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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. COMAH sites 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	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
								When there is an accident on one road on canvey, it grinds to a halt, including most roads leading on and off the island. If there was ever a emergency at either one of the two COMAH sites, the island would be gridlocked and that would put thousands of lives at risk. Doctors and dentists are already full, so where would all these extra people go? We only have 2 secondary schools on the island, which are full. Where would all the extra children go? (If they had to attend				would all these extra people go? We only have 2 secondary schools on the island, which are full. Where would all the extra children go? (If they had to attend schools off the island then that would cause alot more strain on the all ready heavy rush hour traffic. Drainage/sewage is a problem on canvey. It would not be able to cope with all the extra amount of housing. Flooding is an issue, when it rains heavily the drainage system cannot cope. So removing more green space for concrete will cause much more flooding to probably the existing houses already here and most probably the new ones. To be honest I feel scared living here on the island, because if there was an emergency I believe I would have little to no chance of getting off the island now, so with that amount of extra housing, I dread to think!								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 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.'		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
								ones. To be honest I feel scared living here on the island, because if there was an emergency I believe I would have little to no chance of getting off the island now, so with that amount of extra housing, I dread to think!																
0644-0001	Individual	Richard	Morgan		Yes	SP3	No	Falls well short of the government targets.	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Not enough houses. Not a fair spread of houses throughout the borough.		Would just start again without the bias and do a fair, equitable plan for all residents.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not enough houses Not equitably split across the Borough		Housing Numbers 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 deliver the standard method figure in Castle Point. More information on this can be found in the Housing Topic Paper. Site allocations All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).		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
0647-0001	Individual	Fred	die	Smith		Yes	SP3	No	The draft plan is not legally compliant because it does not apply the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) standard method to establish the borough's minimum housing requirement. Paragraph 62 of the NPPF stipulates that strategic policies must be informed by a local housing-need assessment "conducted using the standard method in national planning practice guidance," and, since the December 2024 revision, compliance with that method is	No	Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The proposed plan exhibits significant shortcomings and does not align with the central government's objective of meeting the United Kingdom's housing needs. Current projections indicate that the plan will deliver only 53 percent of the required new homes. Development of the plan has cost taxpayers at least £1.6 million, following a warning notice from the Rt Hon Michael Gove MP in December 2023. Despite this expenditure, the draft does not employ the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) standard method for calculating housing need. Several allocations warrant reconsideration. For example, up to 3,143 homes are designated for the Canvey Urban Sites (Policies C1, C4, C9 and C10). The draft itself acknowledges that Canvey Island faces residual tidal-flood risk and is vulnerable to	To render the Castle Point Plan both legally compliant and sound, the council should incorporate the National Planning Policy Framework's standard method into Policy SP3, explicitly recognising a minimum requirement of 11,662 dwellings for the 2023–2043 period. The plan must then allocate land with the capacity to deliver at least this number of homes by combining intensified use of suitable urban sites, targeted regeneration areas, and the selective release of Green Belt land where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. A sequential site-selection methodology—prioritising previously developed land, unconstrained non-Green-Belt sites, and, where justified, limited Green-Belt locations such as North West Thundersley, which benefits from strategic transport links and	No	Not Answered	Yes	A	Not meeting the Governments Standard Method figure. Flood Risk on Canvey. Third Road onto Canvey. North West Thundersley should be allocated.	Standard Method Housing Target 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 deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. More information on this can be found in the 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 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 onto Canvey The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. Access improvements for 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
							mandatory . Nevertheless, the council’s Report to the Special Meeting of Cabinet (23 July 2025) acknowledges in paragraph 4.6 that the Castle Point Plan provides capacity for only up to 6,196 new urban-area homes by 2043, and concedes in paragraph 4.7 that this falls short of the Government’s identified need of 11,662 dwellings. Moreover, the draft plan currently published for consultation states under Policy SP3 that just 5,100 homes will			surface-water flooding because of its low-lying topography. More than half of the proposed new dwellings would be located in this area, raising questions about whether ground-floor levels can be deemed habitable. Furthermore, Canvey Island is served by only two access roads, and securing funding for a third has historically proved challenging. Alternative options identified by the council appear more compatible with national policy. Pages 46–53 of the Issues and Options Consultation (17 July 2024) demonstrate that “Option 3—North West Thundersley” could bring the borough much closer to meeting the NPPF housing requirement. This site is not subject to significant flood risk and lies adjacent to major transport corridors (the A127 and A130). Dame Rebecca Harris MP has previously observed that, should the council	largely “grey-belt” characteristics—should be set out in the supporting text to show clear compliance with NPPF paragraph 148. Policy wording should be revised accordingly: SP3 would confirm the 11,662-dwelling requirement and commit to meeting it through the three-part land-supply strategy described above. Objective H1 should be updated to state the council’s intention “to meet the full objectively assessed housing need of at least 11,662 dwellings by 2043, thereby supporting economic growth, local affordability, and community well-being.” Finally, an annual Housing Delivery and Land-Supply Position Statement must be published; if delivery falls below 95 percent of the annualised requirement for two consecutive years, a partial plan review would be triggered within twelve months. Collectively, these						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 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 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.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
								be delivered — contradicting the 6,196 figure cited in July 2025. These inconsistencies underscore the plan’s failure to meet the mandatory housing requirement and its lack of clarity regarding the true capacity for delivery.					be required to allocate Green Belt land, North West Thundersley is the only site that merits consideration, being largely screened from the wider borough by Woodside Hill and Woodside Park. Much of the land is also likely to qualify as “grey belt” given its historical use. Despite these advantages, North West Thundersley is omitted from the current draft. While the council emphasises the importance of protecting the Green Belt, development tends to face local opposition wherever it is proposed. Publishing a plan that meets only 53 percent of identified need, without allocating any Green Belt land—even where robust evidence supports doing so—raises concerns about the council’s commitment to delivering the housing required across the borough.	changes align the plan with mandatory national policy, provide a demonstrable route to meeting housing need in full, and introduce a transparent mechanism for on-going monitoring and early review.										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0648-0001	Individual	Derek	Murton			Yes	SP3	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 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 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	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.	No	Not Answered	Yes	C	Not meeting the Governments Standard Method Figure. Ignores Green/Grey Belt Add in North West Thundersley Concerns of Flood Risk on Canvey Concerns of evacuation on Canvey	Standard Method Housing Target 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 deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point. More information on this can be found in the Housing Topic Paper. 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, 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	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																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																

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
																				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. Evacuation procedures The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		
0649-0001	Individual	Laura	Long		Yes	SP3	No		No			Thanks for making this almost impossible for normal people to protest and protect Canvey Island from your development plans. Know this even if your just basic admin processing this disaster your accountable to what happens to the Island and the people on it. The Island is a death trap and putting 3000 more homes on it just makes you all mass murderers.		No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Concerns around emergency planning	The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/	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
0660-0001	Individual	carolyn	blake			Yes	SP3	No	The proposed housing development, to the west of Canvey, is planned on land that serves as a critical habitat for endangered species, including great crested newts and rare wildflowers. Construction on this site risks the destruction of irreplaceable biodiversity and the permanent loss of protected habitats.	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	The plan is unsound because it proposes concentrating the majority of new housing on Canvey Island, which is already subject to severe infrastructure constraints. The island has only two road exits, creating significant congestion and posing safety concerns in emergencies. The area lies below sea level and the existing drainage system is already under strain; further development would increase the risk of flooding, particularly as no sustainable drainage improvements have been outlined. Local services — including schools, GP surgeries, and dental practices — are at or beyond capacity, and there are no credible plans in place to expand these essential facilities to meet the increased demand from additional housing. Regarding the rare local wildlife and fauna: Notable Endangered	The current draft is unsound because it is not positively prepared, not justified, and not effective, contrary to the tests of soundness in paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Transport and Accessibility (NPPF para 108–110) The majority of proposed new housing is allocated to Canvey Island, which has only two road exits. This creates a high risk of severe congestion and hinders emergency evacuation, contrary to NPPF requirements for developments to provide safe and suitable access for all users. No robust transport strategy or infrastructure investment plan has been provided to address these constraints. Flood Risk and Drainage (NPPF para 159–165) Canvey Island is	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Lack of infrastructure on Canvey Infrastructure provision before dwellings are built Third road onto Canvey is needed Wildlife should be protected, especially around Canvey Wick Flood risk on Canvey	Lack of infrastructure provision Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Infrastructure delivered before homes are The Castle Point Plan is accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This identifies all the infrastructure needed to support the proposed growth. Infrastructure will be delivered at different times depending on when it is most appropriate to provide it. For example, access improvements may be delivered during the early phase of a development. A school meanwhile may not be opened until there is enough children to make the revenue costs of running the school sustainable. Sometimes, financial contributions from two or more developments may be needed to provide a particular piece of infrastructure. This may mean the infrastructure is delivered when the last site is coming forward for development. 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	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										
													Invertebrates Some of the nationally important and rare species found in Canvey Wick include: • Canvey Island Ground Beetle (<i>Scybalicus oblongiusculus</i>) — previously thought extinct in Britain and rediscovered here • Shrill Carder Bee (<i>Bombus sylvarum</i>) — one of the UK's rarest bumblebees, surviving in only a few fragmented pockets, including Canvey Wick & surrounding areas • Brown-banded Carder Bee (<i>Bombus humilis</i>) • Five-banded Weevil-wasp (<i>Cerceris quinquefasciata</i>) • Scarce Emerald Damselfly (<i>Lestes dryas</i>) Rich Plant and Fauna Diversity • Surveys have revealed a wealth of wildflowers and orchids, including 1,700 common spotted orchids (<i>Dactylorhiza fuchsii</i>), 500 pyramidal orchids (<i>Anacamptis pyramidalis</i>), and 25 bee orchids (<i>Ophrys apifera</i>) • The site also supports diverse	below sea level and already experiences drainage capacity issues. The existing system is unable to cope with increased surface water from recent developments. The draft plan does not demonstrate that the sequential and exception tests for flood risk have been satisfied, nor that sustainable drainage measures will be implemented before development proceeds. Community Infrastructure (NPPF para 20, 34, and 93) Local schools, GP surgeries, and dental practices are already at or beyond capacity. No deliverable plan or funding mechanism is provided for expanding these facilities to meet the demands of the proposed growth, contrary to NPPF requirements that local plans should plan positively for																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 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. Flood Risk 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 management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4, SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the plan, and supporting		

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
										birdlife, including green woodpecker, stonechat, reed warbler, and west yellow wagtail, as well as growing numbers of nightingales Brownfield Comeback: An Accidental Nature Reserve • Originally an intended oil refinery site that was never fully developed, Canvey Wick & surrounding area, abandoned infrastructure and varied soil composition created a mosaic of habitats—ideal for rare invertebrates • Its varied terrain—ranging from grassland and scrub to bare concrete and wetland—supports exceptional biodiversity per square metre Additionally the area also has adders: Legal status • Protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (Schedule 5) in the UK. • It’s illegal to intentionally kill, injure, or sell them. • Their habitat isn’t fully protected, but disturbing them deliberately is an offence.		the provision of community facilities and services. Proposed Modifications: Rebalance Housing Distribution Amend allocations to reduce the proportion of housing on Canvey Island and redistribute to areas with better transport links, lower flood risk, and existing infrastructure capacity. Transport Infrastructure Commitment Include a binding commitment that no major housing developments on Canvey Island will proceed until a third vehicular access route is operational and congestion mitigation measures are in place. Flood and Drainage Safeguards Require that all new developments on Canvey Island incorporate							evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to 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
												Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and demonstrate no net increase in flood risk, with works completed prior to first occupation. Infrastructure Delivery Plan Revision Update the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to include specific, costed, and funded proposals for additional school places, GP capacity, and dental provision before occupation of new dwellings.									
0669-0001	Individual	Paul	Bennett		Yes	SP3	No	If you build these Properties, were are the vechiles going to get on and off the Island, It takes 1 hour to get from central Canvey to Waterside, or will the Council insited New	No	Consistent with national policy	There's only one way off via Waterside Roundabout	A New Road of the Island, not via Waterside	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	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 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
							Buyers only use Bikes. I feel this plan has been rushed to answer central Government . If a New a new Road was built not going via Water Side it may be a different Story, But Essex Council have ignored the Canvey Peoples request, How long can this go on?												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.		
0670-0001	Individual	brad	evans		Yes	SP3	No		No	Positively prepared	Too many houses allocated to canvey island. With no thought of infrastructure or people's quality of life. Having so many houses built. potentially another 6000 cars converging on one roundabout. There is absolutely no thought for the residents of canvey. If it means building on greenbelt on the mainland to meet the government targets so be it. The	For the housing allocation to be fairly spread over the borough.Maybe Hadleigh farm should be looked at again. I understand more houses will be built on canvey but not the density it states in the plan.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Density Third road onto Canvey Green Belt on the mainland should be released	Density The densities chosen for the sites within the Plan were informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. 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	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
										amount of houses per hectre on canvey is way above any part of the borough.								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 make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. Green Belt on the mainland 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		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.			
0674-0001	Individual	Claire	Davis-Armstrong		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to accommodate the proposed development plan for an additional 3,316+ dwellings. First and foremost, this development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from the Island. There is a single bottleneck entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents. Additionally, Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This	No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative emergency exit from the Island. Should an alternative transportation link be developed, I see far less justification for resistance.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Canvey Island lack of infraststructure Third Road needed Flood Risk	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex specifically identifies three projects which will improve	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
										development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system. Finally, the planning has failed to consider the need for additional amenities, which are already in high demand, such as additional medical practices, dental services, and new senior schools.								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. Flood Risk 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 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0674-0002	Individual	Claire	Davis-Armstrong			Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to accommodate the proposed development plan for an additional 3,316+ dwellings. First and foremost, this development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from the Island. There is a single bottleneck entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents. Additionally, Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system. Finally, the planning has failed to consider the need for additional amenities, which are already in high demand, such as additional medical practices, dental	No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative emergency exit from the Island. Should an alternative transportation link be developed, I see far less justification for resistance.	No	Not Answered				Canvey Island lack of infraststructure Third Road needed Flood Risk	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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. Flood Risk Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is substantially defended from		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
												services, and new senior schools.							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.		
0674-0003	Individual	Claire	Davis-Armstrong		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to accommodate the proposed development plan for an additional 3,316+ dwellings. First and foremost, this development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from the Island. There is a single bottleneck entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents.	No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative emergency exit from the Island. Should an alternative transportation link be developed, I see far less justification for resistance.	No	Not Answered			Canvey Island lack of infrastructure Third Road needed Flood Risk	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 through the Essex Local	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
										Additionally, Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system. Finally, the planning has failed to consider the need for additional amenities, which are already in high demand, such as additional medical practices, dental services, and new senior schools.										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. Flood Risk 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 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.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0674-0004	Individual	Claire	Davis-Armstrong			Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to accommodate the proposed development plan for an additional 3,316+ dwellings. First and foremost, this development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from the Island. There is a single bottleneck entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents. Additionally, Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system. Finally, the planning has failed to consider the need for additional amenities, which are already in high demand, such as additional medical practices, dental	No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative emergency exit from the Island. Should an alternative transportation link be developed, I see far less justification for resistance.	No	Not Answered				Canvey Island lack of infraststructure Third Road needed Flood Risk	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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. Flood Risk Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is substantially defended from		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
												services, and new senior schools.									
0675-0001	Individual	Lynda	farrer			Yes	SP3	Yes	No			☒ Additional amenities have not been considered, including extra medical practices, dental services, and new senior educational institutions. 	As most of us are aware the Castle Point Local Plan has been published and Canvey has been earmarked for the lion's share of development. At first glance responding to the plan consultation is not a straightforward process. Therefore have summarised the salient points below. Please feel free to copy text or amend where necessary: ☒ Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to support this	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Canvey Island lack of infrastructure Third Road needed Flood Risk	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 through the Essex Local	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
												proposed development plan for another 3.5k new dwellings. ☒ This development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from Canvey Island. There is a single bottleneck entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents. ☒ Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system. ☒ Additional amenities have not been considered, including extra medical practices, dental services, and new senior educational institutions. _____ ☒ Suggestion No							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. Flood Risk 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 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents. ☒ Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system. ☒ Additional amenities have not been considered , including extra medical practices, dental services, and new senior educational institutions . ----- ☒ Suggestion					further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative emergency exit from the island											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative emergency exit from the Island.														
0676-0001	Individual	Benji	Massarion		Yes	SP3	No	The Castle Point Plan Draft does not appear to be legally compliant for several key reasons: • Lack of meaningful community engagement: The plan was not prepared in a manner that aligns with the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement. Residents have not	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	I do not consider the Castle Point Plan Draft to be sound for the following reasons: Not Positively Prepared: The plan proposes significant housing growth across Castle Point—particularly on Canvey Island—without delivering the critical infrastructure required to support it. The absence of a third access road to Canvey undermines the plan's ability to meet the area's needs sustainably or safely. Infrastructure and transport capacity are already under significant strain and no realistic solutions have	To make the Castle Point Plan Draft legally compliant and sound, the following modifications should be made: 1. Infrastructure Delivery and Access (Policy IN1, SP1): • Reintroduce and prioritise the creation of a third access road to Canvey Island as a strategic infrastructure objective within the plan period. • Reinstate the Canvey West Access Taskforce to ensure proper delivery oversight and consultation with Essex County Council and the Environment Agency. • Explicitly state	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	lack of DTC Lack of Engagement Flood risk Alignment with the LDS Failure to demonstrate deliverability Third road onto canvey needed Lack of consideration for alternative sites Loss of community facilities not supported	DTC 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. Engagement 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. Flood Risk The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides an overview of flood risk within Castle Point and then provides site specific information for the allocations in the Castle Point Plan and provides recommendations on how to address any flood risk arising through development.	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
								been properly consulted on critical aspects such as infrastructure capacity, site deliverability, and the impact on local services. Proposals to redevelop essential community assets (e.g. health centres, police station, fire station, libraries) were not clearly communicated to the public, which contradicts the requirements for transparent consultation. • Duty to Cooperate not demonstrably fulfilled: The Plan fails to show				been included in the draft. The plan also fails to demonstrate how it has accommodated unmet need from neighbouring areas through agreement or collaboration. Not Justified: The strategy appears to prioritise housing numbers over deliverability, safety, and sustainability. Brownfield sites proposed for redevelopment include vital community infrastructure such as health centres, fire and police stations, and libraries. The plan lacks a clear explanation as to why these sites were chosen over more sustainable or deliverable alternatives. Moreover, there is no clear evidence that alternative strategies—such as lower-density development or infrastructure-first approaches—were adequately considered or consulted on. Not Effective: Many sites included in the	that no further major residential development on Canvey Island should be approved until this access is secured and funded. 2. Site Allocations and Community Facilities (Policies HO1, SP1): • Remove or revise proposals to redevelop key community infrastructure sites (e.g. fire station, health centres, libraries, police station, town centre car parks) listed as “brownfield” without a clearly identified replacement strategy. • Ensure the retention and modernisation of essential community infrastructure is included in the plan as a priority, particularly in underserved or isolated areas such as Canvey Island. 3. Flood Risk and Climate Resilience (Policy CC1): • Require a full site-specific flood risk and drainage assessment for all proposed							Alignment with the LDS To ensure that the plan is supported by a robust evidence base we have had to adjust the timeline to undertake additional work. When these decisions have been made we have updated the LDS to reflect this for transparency. The Council has ensured that the plan has been positively prepared with all necessary work being undertaken to ensure it is robust. Deliverability All the sites allocated within the plan have been promoted through the call for sites process which has indicated that the site is available for development by the landowner. All other sites are Council owned sites which CPBC has deemed available for development. 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 identified through the Essex Local		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							sufficient evidence that Castle Point Borough Council has worked collaboratively with Essex County Council, the Environment Agency, and neighbouring local authorities — especially regarding shared infrastructure, flood risk mitigation, and strategic transport such as a third road access to Canvey Island. Inadequate consideration of flood risk and environmental constraints : Although the plan is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal, it does not			draft are not demonstrably deliverable. Rebecca Harris MP and local stakeholders have pointed out that there is no clear evidence of landowner commitment, infrastructure funding, or timelines to bring sites forward. This undermines the plan’s effectiveness over the plan period. Strategic transport priorities—especially a third access road to Canvey—have been ignored or deferred, despite being critical to enabling growth. Not Consistent with National Policy: The plan does not enable genuinely sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Proposals to build in high flood-risk areas—particularly on Canvey Island—without adequate mitigation or investment in drainage infrastructure directly contradict NPPF principles. In addition, the	development sites on Canvey Island and other flood-prone areas before planning permission can be granted. - Add a policy condition that flood risk must be demonstrably reduced (not just managed) through mitigation measures, including investment in drainage, sea defences, and sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS). - Strengthen wording to ensure compliance with the Section 19 Flood Report recommendations. 4. Housing Delivery (Policy HO1, Appendix A): - Reduce the plan period from 20 years to 15 years to avoid unnecessary overestimation of housing need and reduce strain on infrastructure. - Remove sites from the housing trajectory that lack evidence of landowner commitment or deliverability within the plan period. - Include a phased							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. Alternative sites not considered All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Loss of Community Facilities Policy INFRA1 supports community facilities and safeguards against redevelopment of these without sufficient alternatives provided.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required							
												proposed loss of valued community facilities (libraries, healthcare centres, public services) runs counter to national policy on community cohesion, resilience, and accessibility. For these reasons, I believe the Castle Point Plan fails all four tests of soundness and should be revised significantly before proceeding to submission.	approach to housing delivery tied to infrastructure improvements, ensuring development is not front-loaded before roads, schools, and healthcare capacity are increased. 5. Cross-Boundary Cooperation and Evidence Base (Policy IM1): • Provide an updated and transparent Statement of Common Ground showing joint working with Essex County Council, NHS bodies, utility providers, and neighbouring authorities. • Include clear timelines, funding plans, and outcome targets for all critical infrastructure (transport, education, health) referenced in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. 6. Revised Wording (Suggested): Current Policy SP1 – Spatial Strategy (revision proposed): “Development on															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								shifted repeatedly, raising concerns about whether the statutory process and timeline have been properly followed. • Failure to demonstrate deliverability: Sites have been included in the draft without evidence of deliverability or landowner commitment. This may mislead residents and does not meet legal requirements to present a plan that can be realistically implemented within the identified timeframe. For these reasons, I do not					Canvey Island will only be supported where it is demonstrated that adequate emergency access, flood risk mitigation, and supporting infrastructure are in place and deliverable within the plan period. Strategic development shall not proceed in areas with a single access route unless a secondary access is secured.”									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Draft to be legally compliant under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 or the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.														
0677-0001	Individual	Toni	Dowsett		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Consistent with national policy	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to support this proposed development plan for another 3.5k new dwellings. This development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from Canvey Island. There is a single bottleneck entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and			No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Third road onto Canvey Flooding on Canvey Lack of Infrastructure	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name		Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
												current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents. ☒ Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system. Additional amenities have not been considered, including extra medical practices, dental services, and new senior educational institutions. Suggestion No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative emergency exit from the Island.												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 make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. Flood Risk 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 management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4, SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the plan, and supporting evidence in the form of 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
																		SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey.			
0679-0001	Individual	Dawn	Hawes		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	ENV1 protecting our green spaces. Our island is reclaimed land from the sea . Before 1600 only cows were grazed here, until the Dutch came over and undertook the task of reclaiming the land. We are below sea level. There is no plan to evacuate current residence if we were to have another flood like the one in 1953. There are now floodgates to save London , which put Canvey island at a higher risk of flooding. The Dutch cottages are historic and need a preservation order on them , if they have not already got one. The land is mostly clay under a few feet of top soil.		No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	No plan to evacuate in event of flooding Flood risk on canvey Dutch cottage needs protecting Elderly population No work Third road onto canvey So many houses are not needed due to population decrease Danger of petrol and chemical storage Lack of infrastructure	Evacuation procedures The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ 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 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. Dutch Cottage Dutch Cottage is a listed		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 island has a population of over 50% people over 60 years old. There is not enough work on the island for everybody that lives here. Therefore people need to travel on and off the island to work. We do not have a train or a station on the island . There is one road off that leads to Sadlers farm roundabout. Another small crossing to south Benfleet . If you don't want to go to Southend then you will probably end up back on Sadlers farm roundabout. So unless we have some other means of travel on and off the island, it will be gridlocked. It often is already with just one small accident , blocking the traffic. Please take into consideration before building over 3,000 dwellings. Our population is reducing . Couples now have 1.5 children per family.(national statistics say) . Maybe so many dwellings are not needed. Last but not least													building and no development on the land surrounding the cottage is proposed within this Plan. Elderley Population 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 Assessment Update 2025. No work Chapter 14 of the Castle Point Plan details how the plan will help to support the local economy. 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 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	

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
										is the petrol, chemical storage on the island. It is huge. What would happen if this catches fire? This needs taking into consideration . I think over 3,000 dwellings is far too many. Current infrastructure cannot handle this many people.								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. So many houses are not needed due to population decrease The Local Housing Needs Assessment 2023 and the Local Housing Needs Assessment Update 2025 details the housing need within the Borough. The Housing Capacity Topic paper explains in detail how the number of homes allocated within the plan has been reached. Dangers of Petrol and Chemical Storage 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 development is controlled to limit unnecessary harm to life and property. The extent of these zones is determined by the nature of the goods			

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
																					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 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 development the planning application will be refused on health and safety grounds'. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and 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
																		supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).			
0680-0001	Individual	Paul	Rogers		Yes	SP3	No	The Infrastructure is simply not there to support this number of dwellings on Canvey Island. The access on and off the Island is not sufficient for the existing number of road users	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	It looks like the allocations for Canvey are hugely disproportionate to other parts of the Borough, for example this is just a consultation looking for the public's opinion but the Council have already decided that 0 new homes will be allocated to Daws Heath? Not a single site in that area for even 1 new home has been identified. I also feel like areas of	Look into the feasibility of sites like Blinking owl and potential use of some Greenbelt due to the disregard of residents safety in the existing areas chosen.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Third road onto Canvey Flooding on Canvey Lack of Infrastructure	Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										today and adding thousands more vehicles will make the matter much worse. Canvey does not have the school places to support more children as the existing schools are already over subscribed, as are the doctors and dentists. Other parts of this plan also include sites that are currently used as doctors surgeries. Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding from both the Thames and surface water. Canvey Lake and		potential like the Blinking Owl has been missed as potential sites of large volume housing that will not have the level of impact Canvey would see. The West Canvey site is very close to existing hazardous sites and will make any evacuation of the Island impossible. This is a massive negative impact on residents safety both new and existing. This is a really disturbing disregard of residents safety in favor of not building in other areas.								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 make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. Flood Risk 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 management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4, SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the plan, and supporting evidence in the form of 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 6000 people, if 50% of those home had 1 younger child there would be 1000 places required?														
0680-0002	Individual	Paul	Rogers		Yes	SP3	No	A dph figure of 150 suggests high volume housing will be required such as high rise tower blocks? this is not in keeping with the area and will be an absolute stain on the horizon. This type of area exists in London and they also tend to have a high crime rate. As we have no full time police service on the Island I	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	I feel that the plan is using Canvey as a dumping ground and an easy way out. I do not feel that this plan would pass scrutiny and simply leaving the infrastructure as is will make the Island a horrible place to be. This could negatively impact house prices and then residents will become stuck and not be able to afford to move. The plans allocations are not fairly distributed as some areas have already been confirmed as having 0 new homes despite this only being a consultation where the public allegedly can have an influence. If its just down to public consultation then all areas should be considered with		Consider ALL feasible sites not just ones picked by councilors. Consider the fact that building a large development on some Greenbelt may actually stop massive disruption to existing residents and be better for all in the long run.	No	Not Answered		A	Density Loss of businesses	Density The densities chosen for the sites within the Plan were informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. Loss of Buisnesses 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'. 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.	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

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0680-0003	Individual	Paul	Rogers			Yes	SP3	No		Adding more dwellings to the center of the Island and changing the road layout could cause utter disaster for residents trying to access or leave the Island. Putting hundreds more cars on the road will have a negative impact regardless of the local road layout as all traffic still needs to navigate through Waterside Farm roundabout. Adding this many more homes will increase the need for resident parking which in turn will reduce the availability of visitor	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The distribution of sites within the plan is largely set against the Island and in my opinion show a prejudice against the area. The plan disregards areas such as Daws Heath with a confirmed 0 allocation even at consultation level and does not consider residents safety or wellbeing when it come to hazardous sites or any attempt at an emergency evacuation. The residents of Canvey are being put at risk in favor of appeasing mainland councilors.		Consider all sites including Daws heath and sites like the Blinking Owl where 1 development could house more new homes that potentially the total suggested in the local plan.	No	Not Answered		A	Traffic concerns	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 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.		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
								its removal after years of residents campaigning shows disregard of residents opinion and a lack of understanding.													
0682-0001	Individual	Lisa	Howard		Yes	SP3	No	The Castle Point Plan Draft does not appear to be legally compliant for several key reasons: Lack of meaningful community engagement: The plan was not prepared in a manner that aligns with the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement. Residents have not been properly consulted	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	I do not consider the Castle Point Plan Draft to be sound for the following reasons: Not Positively Prepared: The plan proposes significant housing growth across Castle Point—particularly on Canvey Island—without delivering the critical infrastructure required to support it. The absence of a third access road to Canvey undermines the plan's ability to meet the area's needs sustainably or safely. Infrastructure and transport capacity are already under significant strain and no realistic solutions have been included in the draft. The plan also fails to demonstrate how it	To make the Castle Point Plan Draft legally compliant and sound, the following modifications should be made: 1. Infrastructure Delivery and Access (Policy IN1, SP1): Reintroduce and prioritise the creation of a third access road to Canvey Island as a strategic infrastructure objective within the plan period. Reinstate the Canvey West Access Taskforce to ensure proper delivery oversight and consultation with Essex County Council and the Environment Agency. Explicitly state that no further major residential development on Canvey Island should be	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		lack of DTC Lack of Engagement Flood risk Alignment with the LDS Failure to demonstrate deliverability Third road onto canvey needed Lack of consideration for alternative sites Loss of community facilities not supported	DTC 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. Engagement 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. Flood Risk The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides an overview of flood risk within Castle Point and then provides site specific information for the allocations in the Castle Point Plan and provides recommendations on how to address any flood risk arising through development. Alignment with the LDS To ensure that the plan is supported by a robust	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
							on critical aspects such as infrastructure capacity, site deliverability, and the impact on local services. Proposals to redevelop essential community assets (e.g. health centres, police station, fire station, libraries) were not clearly communicated to the public, which contradicts the requirements for transparent consultation. Duty to Cooperate not demonstrably fulfilled: The Plan fails to show sufficient evidence			has accommodated unmet need from neighbouring areas through agreement or collaboration. Not Justified: The strategy appears to prioritise housing numbers over deliverability, safety, and sustainability. Brownfield sites proposed for redevelopment include vital community infrastructure such as health centres, fire and police stations, and libraries. The plan lacks a clear explanation as to why these sites were chosen over more sustainable or deliverable alternatives. Moreover, there is no clear evidence that alternative strategies—such as lower-density development or infrastructure-first approaches—were adequately considered or consulted on. Not Effective: Many sites included in the draft are not demonstrably deliverable. Rebecca Harris MP and local stakeholders have	approved until this access is secured and funded. 2. Site Allocations and Community Facilities (Policies HO1, SP1): Remove or revise proposals to redevelop key community infrastructure sites (e.g. fire station, health centres, libraries, police station, town centre car parks) listed as “brownfield” without a clearly identified replacement strategy. Ensure the retention and modernisation of essential community infrastructure is included in the plan as a priority, particularly in underserved or isolated areas such as Canvey Island. 3. Flood Risk and Climate Resilience (Policy CC1): Require a full site-specific flood risk and drainage assessment for all proposed development sites on Canvey Island and other flood-prone areas before planning permission can be granted. This must specifically reflect						evidence base we have had to adjust the timeline to undertake additional work. When these decisions have been made we have updated the LDS to reflect this for transparency. The Council has ensured that the plan has been positively prepared with all necessary work being undertaken to ensure it is robust. Deliverability All the sites allocated within the plan have been promoted through the call for sites process which has indicated that the site is available for development by the landowner. All other sites are Council owned sites which CPBC has deemed available for development. 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 identified through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex specifically identifies three				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
							that Castle Point Borough Council has worked collaboratively with Essex County Council, the Environment Agency, and neighbouring local authorities — especially regarding shared infrastructure, flood risk mitigation, and strategic transport such as a third road access to Canvey Island.				pointed out that there is no clear evidence of landowner commitment, infrastructure funding, or timelines to bring sites forward. This undermines the plan’s effectiveness over the plan period. Strategic transport priorities—especially a third access road to Canvey—have been ignored or deferred, despite being critical to enabling growth.		the island’s unique constraints — low elevation, high groundwater levels, tidal influence, and reliance on pumped discharge — which render infiltration-based SuDS measures such as soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable paving reliant on infiltration, and unlined attenuation basins unsuitable and potentially hazardous. Swales designed for infiltration would not function effectively under Canvey’s tidal and storm conditions. Policy must require that only drainage solutions compatible with the pumped network and capable of mechanical discharge be used, avoiding the inappropriate application of infiltration systems designed for other areas. Strengthen wording to ensure compliance with the Section 19 Flood Report recommendations.						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.			
							Inadequate consideration of flood risk and environmental constraints : Although the plan is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal, it does not adequately address				Not Consistent with National Policy: The plan does not enable genuinely sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Proposals to build in high flood-risk areas—particularly on Canvey Island—without adequate mitigation or investment in drainage infrastructure directly contradict NPPF principles. In addition, the proposed loss of valued community facilities (libraries, healthcare centres, public services) runs counter to								Alternative sites not considered All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).		Loss of Community Facilities Policy INFRA1 supports community facilities and safeguards against redevelopment of these without sufficient alternatives provided.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 environmental consequences of building on Canvey Island, a known flood-prone area. This is particularly critical given the island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure — its low elevation, high groundwater levels, tidal influence and reliance on pumped discharge — which make infiltration-based systems such as soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable paving that depends on infiltration, and unlined attenuation				national policy on community	Delivery (Policy HO1, Appendix A): Reduce the plan period from 20 years to 15 years to avoid unnecessary overestimation of housing need and reduce strain on infrastructure. Remove sites from the housing trajectory that lack evidence of landowner commitment or deliverability within the plan period. Include a phased approach to housing delivery tied to infrastructure improvements, ensuring development is not front-loaded before roads, schools, and healthcare capacity are increased. 5. Cross-Boundary Cooperation and Evidence Base (Policy IM1): Provide an updated and transparent Statement of Common Ground showing joint working with Essex County Council, NHS bodies, utility providers, and neighbouring authorities. Include clear timelines, funding										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								n basins ineffective at best and dangerous at worst. These systems rely on natural infiltration, which Canvey’s ground conditions do not support, risking new flooding or groundwater contamination. Swales designed primarily for infiltration could fail under high tide or storm conditions. Any on-site drainage solution that cannot be mechanically discharged or connected into a properly managed and maintained system poses an unacceptable risk.					plans, and outcome targets for all critical infrastructure (transport, education, health) referenced in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. 6. Revised Wording (Suggested): Current Policy SP1 – Spatial Strategy (revision proposed): “Development on Canvey Island will only be supported where it is demonstrated that adequate emergency access, flood risk mitigation, and supporting infrastructure are in place and deliverable within the plan period. Strategic development shall not proceed in areas with a single access route unless a secondary access is secured.”											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
								timeline have been properly followed. Failure to demonstrate deliverability: Sites have been included in the draft without evidence of deliverability or landowner commitment. This may mislead residents and does not meet legal requirements to present a plan that can be realistically implemented within the identified timeframe.														
0684 - 0001	Individual	Shirralee	Leggett		Yes	SP3	No	Canvey island infrastructure cannot take anymore houses or flats being built. We need a second road now with the	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Please live on canvey for a week and you will realise it will be a complete disaster to build more homes on an island that struggles with traffic water pipes now with the amount of people already living here now.			Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		Third road off Canvey	Third Road off 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		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
								homes we already have on the island it will be a complete disaster to have more houses built and people to live on an already over populated area.												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 make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan.		
0685-0001	Individual	Lorraine	Breading		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Justified	The proportion of new buildings being considered for canvey island is disproportionate to the size of the borough. It is also a flood plain and there is no guarantee that the infrastructure would be in place to allow for the ease of traffic to and from the island.		There would need to be a third access from the Island that does not go through waterside roundabout, sadlers farm roundabout or benfleet. There would also need to be better access to medical facilities and schooling. Canvey Island is classified as a deprived area and therefore for what is in effect a large housing influx there must be scope for more employment and training built in to the plan.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Third Road off Canvey Infrastructure Flood Risk on Canvey Employment and Training	Third Road off 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex specifically identifies three projects which will improve	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
																					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 the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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. Employment and Training Policy E3 encourages and supports development of local skills.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0686-0001	Individual	Greg	Saddington			Yes	SP3	No	The overpopulation of canvey island is a health risk to islanders in the event and evacuation is required. Adding additional properties breaches the duty of care to residents.	No	Effective, Justified	There is ONE exit from canvey that all 40000 population need to use. The infrastructure on any measures cannot cope with a further increase in population		New exit from canvey separate from waterside roundabout		No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Emergency Evacuation Third Road off Canvey	Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ Third Road off 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 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.	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
0688-0001	Individual	Teresa	Kelway			Yes	SP3	No	The Castle Point Plan Draft does not appear to be legally compliant for several key reasons:Lack of meaningful community engagement: The plan was not prepared in a manner that aligns with the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement. Residents have not been properly consulted on critical aspects such as infrastructure capacity, site deliverability, and the impact on local services. Proposals to redevelop essential	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	I do not consider the Castle Point Plan Draft to be sound for the following reasons: Not Positively Prepared: The plan proposes significant housing growth across Castle Point—particularly on Canvey Island—without delivering the critical infrastructure required to support it. The absence of a third access road to Canvey undermines the plan's ability to meet the area's needs sustainably or safely. Infrastructure and transport capacity are already under significant strain and no realistic solutions have been included in the draft. The plan also fails to demonstrate how it has accommodated unmet need from neighbouring areas through agreement or collaboration. Not Justified: The strategy appears to prioritise housing numbers over deliverability, safety, and sustainability. Brownfield sites proposed for redevelopment	To make the Castle Point Plan Draft legally compliant and sound, the following modifications should be made: 1. Infrastructure Delivery and Access (Policy IN1, SP1):Reintroduce and prioritise the creation of a third access road to Canvey Island as a strategic infrastructure objective within the plan period. Reinstate the Canvey West Access Taskforce to ensure proper delivery oversight and consultation with Essex County Council and the Environment Agency. Explicitly state that no further major residential development on Canvey Island should be approved until this access is secured and funded. 2. Site Allocations and Community Facilities (Policies HO1, SP1):Remove or revise proposals to redevelop key community infrastructure sites (e.g. fire station, health centres, libraries, police	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		lack of DTCLack of EngagementFlood riskAlignment with the LDSFailure to demonstrate deliverabilityThird road onto canvey neededLack of consideration for alternative sitesLoss of community facilities not supported	DTCAddressed 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.EngagementComments 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.Flood RiskThe Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides an overview of flood risk within Castle Point and then provides site specific information for the allocations in the Castle Point Plan and provides recommendations on how to address any flood risk arising through development.Alignment with the LDSTo ensure that the plan is supported by a robust evidence base we have had to adjust the timeline to undertake additional work. When these decisions have been made we have updated the LDS to reflect this for transparency. The Council has ensured that the plan has been positively prepared with all necessary work being undertaken to ensure it is robust. DeliverabilityAll the sites allocated within the plan have been promoted through the call for sites process which has indicated that the site is available for development by the landowner. All other sites are Council owned sites 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		
												been ignored or deferred, despite being critical to enabling growth. Not Consistent with National Policy: The plan does not enable genuinely sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Proposals to build in high flood-risk areas—particularly on Canvey Island—without adequate mitigation or investment in drainage infrastructure directly contradict NPPF principles. In addition, the proposed loss of valued community facilities (libraries, healthcare centres, public services) runs counter to national policy on community cohesion, resilience, and accessibility.											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Regulation s or fully assessed flood mitigation and drainage infrastructure in line with legal obligations . Unclear alignment with the Local Development Scheme: The Council’s own timetable and approach outlined in the Local Development Scheme have shifted repeatedly, raising concerns about whether the statutory process and timeline have been properly followed. Failure to demonstrate deliverability: Sites have been included in the draft					providers, and neighbouring authorities. Include clear timelines, funding plans, and outcome targets for all critical infrastructure (transport, education, health) referenced in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. 6. Revised Wording (Suggested):Current Policy SP1 – Spatial Strategy (revision proposed): “Development on Canvey Island will only be supported where it is demonstrated that adequate emergency access, flood risk mitigation, and supporting infrastructure are in place and deliverable within the plan period. Strategic development shall not proceed in areas with a single access route unless a secondary access is secured.”									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								without evidence of deliverability or landowner commitment. This may mislead residents and does not meet legal requirements to present a plan that can be realistically implemented within the identified timeframe.																
0689 - 0001	Individual	Michelle	Lyon		Yes	SP3	No	You've made it too complex for the average person to understand therefore non inclusive	No	Justified	I can't get off the island to get to work already and I often can't get home. When there's an emergency everything grinds to a standstill		A third road, more schools and doctors and dentists because I already have to get off the island to access amenities	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Third Road onto Canvey Infrastructure Consultation Inclusivity		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		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
0698-0001	Individual	Richard	Bonham			Yes	SP3	Yes		No			To many people on Canvey island , Thorney bay and kings have too many mobile homes		No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Castle point Plan is not sound.	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
0703-0001	Individual	Karon	Roberts		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Justified		Unfortunately Reg 19 on housing has taken all the oxygen out of the plan and no one seems interested in anything else because it is not fair. Canvey is taking the brunt of the housing needs for the borough as we do not have much green belt land. It seems the loaded question in the consultation puts green belt use above safety and common sense. How can you expect another 3 thousand plus homes on the island with no new infrastructure, roads, gp surgeries, schools etc. 3 thousand plus houses equates at minimum to 3 thousand extra cars. On a Saturday morning you cannot leave the island in less than an hour. One broken down car at anytime will bring the island to a halt. Until there is a new road there should be no more building. Why has NW Hadleigh not been allocated more housing?	Making the housing allocation fairer across the borough. Consider other areas green belt if necessary.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West Thundersley Third Road onto Canvey Infrastructure	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. 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 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	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
																		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 the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).			
0704-0001	Individual	Kevin	Walker		Yes	SP3	No	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to support this proposed development plan for another 3.5k new dwellings. ☒ This development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from Canvey Island. There is a single bottleneck entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Not justified or to national policy standards And definitely over development	Definitely over development NW Thundersley has not been considered has a location for all the housing	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Third Road onto Canvey Flooding on Canvey Infrastructure	Third Road off 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 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	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
								t, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents. ☒ Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system. ☒ Additional amenities have not been considered , including extra medical practices, dental services, and new senior educational institutions .														projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0704-0002	Individual	Kevin	Walker			Yes	SP3	No	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to support this proposed development plan for another 3.5k new dwellings. ☒ This development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from Canvey Island. There is a single bottleneck entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents. ☒ Canvey Island is	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Over-development to a location that is already saturated with people and lacking the infrastructure for the people that live here already No thought of the North West Thundersley site	Suggestion 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 substantial allocation of housing without adversely affecting the traffic flow in the remainder of Castle Point.	No	Not Answered			Third Road onto Canvey Flooding on Canvey Infrastructure	Third Road off 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 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 the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Flood Risk on Canvey Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is substantially defended from	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
										Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents. ☒ Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system. ☒ Additional amenities have not been considered, including extra medical practices, dental services, and new senior educational institutions.	links allowing for a substantial allocation of housing without adversely affecting the traffic flow in the remainder of Castle Point.							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 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 the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4, SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the plan, and supporting evidence in the form of 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
																		SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey.			
0705-0001	Individual	Graham	Montford		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to support this proposed development plan for another 3500 new dwellings. This development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from Canvey Island. There is a poor entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents or during non peak travel time Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden	No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative exit from Canvey Island & sufficient drainage improvements are made within the infrastructure.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Third Road onto Canvey Flooding on Canvey Infrastructure	Third Road off 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 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	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
												on the current drainage system.							Local Transport Plan. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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.		
0705-0002	Individual	Graham	Montford		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to support this proposed development plan for another 3500 new dwellings. This development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from Canvey	No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative exit from Canvey Island & sufficient drainage improvements are made within the infrastructure.	No	Not Answered		A	Third Road onto Canvey Flooding on Canvey Infrastructure	Third Road off 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	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
										Island. There is a poor entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents or during non peak travel time Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system.								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 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 the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 management 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
																			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.		
0705-0003	Individual	Graham	Montford		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to support this proposed development plan for another 3500 new dwellings. This development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from Canvey Island. There is a poor entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents or during non peak travel time Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden	No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative exit from Canvey Island & sufficient drainage improvements are made within the infrastructure.	No	Not Answered		A	Third Road onto Canvey Flooding on Canvey Infrastructure	Third Road off 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 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	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
												on the current drainage system.							Local Transport Plan. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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.		
0705-0004	Individual	Graham	Montford		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Canvey Island lacks the infrastructure to support this proposed development plan for another 3500 new dwellings. This development would impose a significant burden on the roads for Canvey residents who require access to and from Canvey	No further development should take place until an additional road is established as an alternative exit from Canvey Island & sufficient drainage improvements are made within the infrastructure.	No	Not Answered		A	Third Road onto Canvey Flooding on Canvey Infrastructure	Third Road off 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	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
										Island. There is a poor entrance/exit at the Waterside roundabout, and current residents often find themselves in traffic jams for extended periods, even in the absence of any incidents or during non peak travel time Canvey Island is already susceptible to flooding. This development would impose an intolerable burden on the current drainage system.								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 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 the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 management 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
																					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.		
0706-0001	Individual	Peter	Arter		Yes	SP3	No	Whilst I agree with and support the local plan vision for the Hadleigh Farm area, being a local resident there for over 40 years, I am concerned, having read the comments of our MP, Dame Rebecca Harris, that the plan does not at present meet national policy and is not justified in that it does not meet policy targets and has not	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	see my previous comments above.		Inclusion of North West Thundersley site.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								even included any greenbelt or grey belt sites including particularly the North West Thundersley site. for further detail see the comments of Dame Harris, with which I fully agree.														
0707-0001	Individual	linda	wells		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Sandy Bay is increasing by 300 dwellings over the next 2 years this is not in any plan or accounted for. The infrastructure is already stretched, schools, doctors etc. I find it difficult to move round the island as it is so with extra housing this is going to be mere impossible regardless of any additional exit roads added. I feel the utilisation of North West Hadleigh would be a better option for the 3000 homes and would allow Charfleets to remain without having to be relocated.			No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Existing Commitments North West Thundersley Infrastructure	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). However, it is agreed that the plan could have been clearer on this point and a modification is proposed to signpost this reference in the supporting text. 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		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
												There is no justification for the density levels to be increased just on Canvey Island without due consideration to other Brownfield sites within Castle Point.							Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).		
0711-0001	Individual	philip	haste			Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Much better sites are available rather than worsen a already congested Canvey island and in fact the whole of castle point There is land in North Benfleet (green belt it may be but there is so much more beneficial green belt around and this is a small amount to sacrifice) adjacent to the A127/A130 that could have great road links installed and accommodate all of Castle points housing developments to satisfy Government in one place. A sacrifice of 1 small piece of Green belt should be considered rather than sacrifice the well being of existing and future people of castle point by making there lives a misery by over	Before any planning is approved or development is carried out the existing road structure on canvey island needs to be looked at. The 1st is to proceed with the development of Roscommon way phase 2 to greatly improve traffic flow around the island. The 2 main traffic problem areas are Sommes avenue to Dovervelt road both ways as well as Northwick corner through the village to Thorney bay road. By extending the Roscommon way phase 1 with phase 2 as originally planned but never completed. Essex Highways' Roscommon Way Extension Phase 2 was planned to	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West Thundersley Third Road onto 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 evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. 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	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
										congesting existing small areas. Before any passing of developments my comment should be considered below		extend the new route from Haven Road to Thorney Bay Road on Canvey Island, providing an alternative route for commercial traffic and supporting future development. While Phase 1 was completed, Phase 2 faced funding issues in 2018 and remains unfinished, with the completion of the final phase described as "vitally important" for easing congestion and supporting the local economy. Phase 1 (Completed) Phase 2 (Planned, but Unfinished) Planned Extension: Phase 2 was designed to continue the route from Haven Road to Thorney Bay Road. Aims: The goals included further regenerating the local economy, providing a flood-safe route off the island, diverting traffic from residential areas, and enabling further development.						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 make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport 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
														Funding Issues: In 2018, a report stated that there was "no cash" to finish the project, and the completion of the final phase was described as "vitally important" for the local economy and for easing island congestion. This would be a great step to alleviate the traffic congestion on Canvey and should have been carried out in 2018. However the third road (where that assumption comes from I don't know as there is still only 1 access point onto Canvey where the two access roads meet which is Waterside Farm roundabout) A new route continuing Northwick Road across to Coryton/Stanford-le-hope should be urgently considered. This would reduce traffic on the already congested saddler's farm roundabout although most likely increase traffic flow onto the island with vehicles accessing											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
													south Benfleet via Canvey								
0712-0001	Individual	Simon	Fitzgerald		Yes	SP3	No	I believe it is unsafe and that the general impact on the overall community puts it at risk. Sewage issues have not been identified namely the additional 2700 homes in the Charfleets area. Canvey Island has the second worst sewage issue within the country that is directly affecting the sea front along	No	Consistent with national policy	Sewage and the impact on the general area. Traffic congestion and the impact to life especially in a time of a major incident happening on the Island.	Review the areas where it would be more suitable within the actual Borough rather than just Canvey Island	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		Charfleets Other sites have not been considered Sewage infrastructure	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'. 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. Other sites have not been considered All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	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
								with a huge issue regarding a smell which is constantly in the air. There are other more suitable and safe areas within the Borough which can be identified and built on without having the same negative impact. The plan will fail and time and effort wasted in general. The Council need to admit this and openly honest regarding the whole process										Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare, education and sewage) 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
0715-0001	Individual	Michael	Jarrett			Yes	SP3	No	This plan allows for only 6196 new homes over the plan period. This is absolutely nowhere near legal compliance with the mandatory central government target, which is over 11,000 new homes.	No	Consistent with national policy	This plan allows for only 6196 new homes over the plan period. This is absolutely nowhere near legal compliance with the mandatory central government target, which is over 11,000 new homes.	The plan should include extensive development on the 'blinking owl' site, in north west Thundersley. The total number of new homes proposed under the local plan must be increased, in line with the legally mandated central government number of dwellings target for Castle Point.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting the Standard Method number North West Thundersley	Standard Method Housing Number The Standard Methodology requirement for Castle Point is 686 homes per year (as of June 2025). 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 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. More information on this is set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those	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
																			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.		
0734-0002	Individual	Deborah	Johnstone		Yes	SP3	No	Unfortunately I do not consider the plan to be sound as it stands now. I don't believe that the government will consider it credible as a five-year land supply. The plan fails to consider viable alternatives that could easily accommodate more realistic numbers (i.e. North West Thundersley).	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	The plan doesn't meet the housing number target as specified by the government for Castle Point. This therefore puts us at risk for intervention, where we could no longer have a say on which additional areas are to be developed, and puts too much risk on us losing our most valuable green belt sites. The plan ignores government guidance re: inclusion of green/grey belt sites. The plan does not consider all viable green/grey belt sites, i.e. North West Thundersley. The plan puts too	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		A	No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley	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 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	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
												much strain on already overdeveloped parts of the borough, i.e., Canvey, that lack the infrastructure to accommodate additional housing numbers (not to mention flooding and drainage issues). NW Thundersley on the other hand, could be developed with additional measures and connected to the A13 / A127.							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 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.		
0742-0001	Individual	Michael	Curry		Yes	SP3	No		No	Justified	Too much congestion (traffic) and no improvement of infrastructure. Probably the council will introduce a congestion fee like London because of the increase of new properties to be built	Don't go ahead	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Too much traffic No Infrastructure	Traffic 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 Essex Local Transport Plan 4, 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
																					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).		
0749-0002	Individual	Gabriella	Kwolek		Yes	SP3	No	Do not build more homes	No			Do not build more homes			No	Not Answered		A	Dont build any more homes		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 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	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
0751-0001	Individual	SHARON	GOODMAN			Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like north west thundersley.no credible five year housing land supply.	No	Consistent with national policy	The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy.does not meet the housing target for castle point.site selection ignores green belt/grey belt against new np of guidelines.the draft local plan is not justified.site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a no green belt build policy site selection is based on the over development of brown field. not considered all,no green belt/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.the 3316 urban homes for canvey is not	Add north west thundersley site,187Ha,a green belt/greybelt./brown field site option for 7500 homes.reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200,with canvey at 1050.total housing target of 11000.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		No Five Year Housing Land Supply North West Thundersley Flood risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation concerns	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 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	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
												resident let.canvey west homes puts residents in the east at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.									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. 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. Flooding 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 management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4, SD1, SD2 and SD3 of 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. 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

plan, and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey.

Emergency Evacuation
The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here
www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0754-0001	Individual	Yvonne	Walker			Yes	SP3	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 / Greybelt 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 / greybelt 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. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha, a greenbelt / greybelt / brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11000.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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 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.	Green/Grey Belt	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
														evacuation procedures.									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, 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. 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
																		Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Flooding 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/			
0755-0001	Individual	Anthony	Stacey		Yes	SP3	No	How on earth can further overcrowding an already overcrowded island be legally compliant	No	Effective	The island is already overcrowded with insufficient routes on and off the Island. The building of this many additional homes is only going to exasperate matters further. Even	Remove all additional housing. This Island cannot cope with more housing.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Remove all Housing on Canvey	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
												building a second route off the Island will not compensate for the additional homes.									
0756-0001	Individual	James	Giddins		Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like north west thundersley	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 development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	Draft document 'legally compliant' and/or 'sound', including any revised wording. Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha, 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.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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 be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, 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. 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
										and drainage infrastructure. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures								from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper. 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, 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. 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. Flooding 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0759-0002	Individual	BARRY	BURNETT			Yes	SP3	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy		1. I do NOT believe that the Castle Point Plan is fully legally compliant 2. I do NOT believe that the Castle Point Plan is sound 3. I believe that the proposal for over 3.3K homes on Canvey Island is disproportional and fails to fully consider all environmental and infrastructure impacts 4. In my opinion the site in North West Thundersley should be included in the Plan 5. I do not consider that a sound projection for five-year housing land supply has been provided. In my opinion the Plan in its current state does not meet the legal tests of soundness and compliance. There appears to be a sense of isolationism in the plan, in that there is little within the plan to demonstrate that the impact of the proposals have been discussed with adjoining authorities, and in my opinion it has the appearance that several assumptions have been made and left		No	Not Answered	Yes		Environmental impacts Infrastructure impacts North West Thundersley Five year housing land supply DTC	Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies 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 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 target. It is therefore	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
												Additionally, the Plan does not contain a deliverable five-year supply of housing land for either the Government's or Council's housing targets. Taking all of this together my opinion is that the absence of robust and transparent discussion to competently indicate that all potential sites have been considered is worrying. This failure leaves all of Castle Point's Green Belt (with a potential for development) open to speculative development. For these reasons I do not believe that the draft plan is legally compliant in the current state, and requires further revision to ensure that development is sustainable, justified, and in the public interest. I was also very surprised to see the high density of housing suggested for Canvey given the drainage issues and risk of flooding, plus the problems with accessibility due to infrastructure restrictions.									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name		Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 housing target imposed by the Government is ludicrously large, and impossible given the infrastructure and fragile nature of the area. This must be resisted, else the character and social structure of Castle Point would be irrevocably damaged. However, I do not believe that the Plan has gone far enough in discussing and justifying why the significantly lower numbers are more appropriate than those dictated by central Government. As mention above, the case is severely weakened by the rejection of the NW Thundersley site. Worryingly, without proper justification the Plan aims to only achieve around 53% of the housing target over the 17-year plan period. The exclusion of NW Thundersley undermines the claim that the Plan has been positively prepared. With a plan that offers just over half of the Governments housing											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										requirements with NW Thundersley rejected and no other Green Belt sites included I believe that the Planning Inspector will insist on Green Belt being made available – and this would mean that all such areas In the borough would be up for speculative planning applications whilst the council deliberates on which areas should be sacrificed. Worse still, the plan is open to the Secretary of State taking such powers away from the Council and arbitrarily deciding where the full Government quota of houses should go. Although Green Belt sites should be protected in the plan, I believe that NW Thundersley should be considered as an exception; a sacrifice to make the plan robust and protect the remainder of the Green Belt areas. This area is a mix of Green belt, Grey Belt and Brownfield sites, offering the opportunity for infrastructure-led growth in 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
												sustainable location and so doing would relieve pressure on more vulnerable areas. I have read elsewhere that the Blinking Owl site alone has the potential for over 5,000 homes, and whilst the NW Thundersley area has some Green Belt, the site mostly comprises Grey Belt plotlands, light industrial units, and inaccessible land. This would provide the exciting prospect of developing a new zone for sustainable growth. With careful planning I understand that there is sufficient area to build here and also to maintain the vital buffer between Benfleet and Thundersley. The inclusion of this site would make the 17 year plan more robust, potentially delivering a housing target nearer to that dictated by Central Government.									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0761-0001	Individual	Ralph	Cornish			Yes	SP3	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 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 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha, 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.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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 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.	Green/Grey Belt	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
												evacuation procedures.										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, 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. 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
																					Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Flooding 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0762-0001	Individual	vivienne	bowyer		Yes	SP3	No		No	Positively prepared	Anglian Water is already having difficulty in providing water and sewage, these plans in addition to the extra use of water required for the new rubbish plans will tip these resources over the top. Are all depts consulted ? Are you providing a helicopter pad to get people to hospitals if the need arises ? The roads are already congested all these extra houses will mean an increase in traffic.			No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Has the water companies been consulted? Emergency services access Traffic	Water companies consulted? Yes we have consulted Essex and Suffolk Water and Anglian Water and have statements of common ground agreed. Emergency services Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Traffic 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 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.	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
0764-0001	Individual	Elizabeth	Ellis			Yes	SP3	No	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	I am not expert in public/national policy so cannot comment as to whether the plan presented is consistent with it. However I can say I see no evidence of objectively assessed needs in the plan. I do not see evidence of the consideration of proportionate alternatives and I do not believe the plan can and will be effectively delivered in the plan period. The housing sites for example are piecemeal and unlikely to achieve anywhere near the target figures. As a minor point the plan period needs to be clarified or amended it is nonsensical to have 2023 as a start date.		Provision of evidence of objective assessments of all key matters, evidence of alternative proposals and approaches, proposed timescales for delivery which housing developments for example will be delivered in 5 years? 10 years? A most basic timeline could and should be provided for all elements.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	No Evidence of alternative sites being considered Timescales of delivery not provided Not meeting housing targets Change the start date as 2023 is nonsensical	Alternative sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Timescales of delivery Policy SP3 provides a timeline for the delivery of homes throughout the plan period. Not Meeting Housing Targets 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 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.	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
																			Change the start date The start date has been ammended to 2026.		
0764-0002	Individual	Elizabeth	Ellis		Yes	SP3	No	I am not able to comment on legality this is a moot point. However the plan does not show evidence of consultation with neighbouring authorities .	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Please also refer to previous comments regarding soundness. No evidence of objective assessment of needs. No evidence of alternatives No evidence of even the most basic timeline and therefore cannot be sure the plan can be effectively delivered within its timeline. How I assess whether it is consistent with national policy is totally unclear but I would again defer to Dame Rebecca Harris MP's formal response to the		No	Not Answered		A	No evidence of DTC	DTC is 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
													plan for details on this I fully support her response.									
0766-0001	Individual	Terri	Dines			Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider other alternatives, for example North West Thundersley. No creditable 5 year housing supply	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy		The draft local plan is not justified with national policy. It doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. The site selected ignores the green/grey belt against new NPPF guidelines. the plan is not justified. The site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt policy" Site selection is based on the overdevelopment of Brownfield sites. Not all sites considered, no green/grey belt sites added and with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be direct away from areas at high risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	North West Thundersley site. 187Ha A greenbelt Brownfield site option for 7500 homes and reduce the urban housing target from 6200 to 3500 with Canvey at 1050.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey	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 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	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
										and drainage infrastructure. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey in not resident led. Canvey west homes puts residents in the East of Canvey at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.								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. 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, 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. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in 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
																			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. Flooding 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 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0767-0001	Individual	Jemma	Roche		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Justified	If we can only have all the improvements with the building of residential homes, then the plan does not justify the need for Canvey. Islanders need better infrastructure, but at the detrimental cost of more people on the island, more housing is not a solution.		Provide all the updates but without the detrimental cost of the new homes. Having more people live here will not improve anything	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	No homes, more infrastructure	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 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. 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
0769-0001	Individual	joan	Staples			Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like north west thundersley. No credible 5 year housing supply	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	The draft local plan is not justified with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for castle point. Site selections ignore 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 built policy" Site selection is based on the overdevelopment of Brownfield sites. Not all sites considered, No Greenbelt/grey belt sites added and with the exclusion of North west Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from area's at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. The 3316 Urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East of Canvey at risk with emergency	North west Thundersley site. 187Ha Agreenbelt Grey belt Brownfield site option for 7500 homesReduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200 with Canvey at 1050 Total housing target of 11000 homes	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Lack of Five Year Housing Land SupplyGreen/Grey Belt not consideredNorth West Thundersley Flood Risk on CanveyEmergency Evacuation Concerns	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, 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 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 housing topic paper.Green/Grey BeltThe Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in	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
												evacuation procedures.									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 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.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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
																			preferred.Flooding on CanveyWhilst 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 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.Emergency EvacuationThe Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		
0772-0001	Individual	Karen	Castle		Yes	SP3	No		No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Does meet the target and has excluded viable alternative sites	Look at alternative brown and grey belt sites especially NW thundersley	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Doesnt meet housing targets North West Thundersley	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		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
																					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. 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0773-0001	Individual	Louise	Collins			Yes	SP3	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 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 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha, 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.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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 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.	Green/Grey Belt	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
												evacuation procedures									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, 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. 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First 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
																Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Flooding 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0774-0001	Individual	James	Robbins			Yes	SP3	No	This report demonstrates that this approach creates two critical vulnerabilities. First, the plan disproportionately concentrates new housing on Canvey Island, with over 3,300 homes allocated to the town. This concentration is likely to place an intolerable strain on the island's limited infrastructure, particularly its road network, which is prone to significant congestion. Second, the council's absolute prohibition on Green Belt development, without a fully evidenced justification	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The council's failure to present unassailable evidence could lead to the plan being found unsound, forcing a revision that could ultimately result in the very outcomes it sought to avoid. 6. Critical Analysis of Major Planning Issues 6.1 The Disproportionate Burden on Canvey Island The concentration of over 3,300 new homes on Canvey Island is a highly contentious issue that underpins much of the local opposition to the new plan.	Conform to the national guidelines	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Infrastructure Transport Green Belt	Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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. 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 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	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
								n for why alternative sites like higher-density brownfield development have been exhausted, runs contrary to NPPF guidance. This rigid stance may be legally challenged by the Planning Inspectorate, potentially leading to a forced revision of the plan or a declaration that it is unsound, which could, in a paradoxical outcome, result in the very Green Belt release the plan was designed to prevent								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 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
0776-0001	Individual	Brenda	Norman		Yes	SP3	No	What a [REDACTED] load of gobaldego ok [REDACTED] Due To Personal Information] Let me say in plain English , if I am allowed, this [REDACTED] island is already overcrowded, it can't take anymore houses , [REDACTED] stop building, Is this [REDACTED] plain enough for you [REDACTED] .	No				Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		No Houses	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 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.	N		
0777-0001	Individual	Brian	Palmer		Yes	SP3	No	The North West Thundersley or known as (The Blinking Owl Site) has not been considered and this answers	No	Positively prepared	North West Thundersley (The Blinking Owl Site.) has not been considered which would resolve most of the problems the existing Plan Draft at the moment .	Using the North West Thundersley ie The Blinking Owl Site resolves a lot of the existing problems. Also help with problems with the existing Road Network for the future.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		North West Thundersley Transport	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	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
																			August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. 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 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. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								>> More Houses ?																	
0778-0001	Individual	Janet	Effeny			Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible 5 year housing supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	The draft local plan is not justified with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for castle point. 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 built policy "Site selection is based on the overdevelopment brownfield sites. Not all sites considered .No greenbelt/grey belt sites added and with the exclusion Northwest Thundersley NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding.SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island unique geography and drainage	Add North west Thundersley site.187Ha Agreenbelt Grey belt brownfield site option for 7500 homes .Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200 with Canvey at1050 Total housing target of 11000 homes.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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		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
														infrastructure. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led Canvey West homes puts residents in the East of Canvey at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.								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. 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, 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. North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is 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
																						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. Flooding 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0780-0001	Individual	Dean	Haste			Yes	SP3	No	FAILED TO CONSIDER STRATEGIC ALTERNATIVES LIKE NORTH WEST THUNDERSLEY. NO CREDIBLE 5 YEAR HOUSING SUPPLY	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	The draft local plan is not justified with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for castle point. Site selections ignore 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 built policy" Site selection is based on the overdevelopment of Brownfield sites. Not all sites considered, No Greenbelt/grey belt sites added and with the exclusion of North west Thundersley. NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from area's at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. The 3316 Urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East of Canvey at risk with emergency	North west Thundersley site. 187Ha 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 11000 homes	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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 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.	Green/Grey Belt	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
												evacuation procedures.										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, 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. 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Flooding 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0781-0001	Individual	Justin	King			Yes	SP3	No	This plan is unfair, unjust and unachievable for Canvey when there are viable options like the blinking owl site. Canvey's infrastructure is already overloaded, so I know, let's build all these new homes without a thought for the people of Canvey who already suffer. When you asked the questions last year regarding whether we would like to build on either greenbelt or brownbelt, you full well knew everyone would have said brownbelt, but if you	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 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 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha, 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.	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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 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.	Green/Grey Belt	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
																					Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Flooding 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0782-0001	Individual	Tracy	Empson			Yes	SP3	No	FAILED TO CONSIDER STRATEGIC ALTERNATIVES FOR INSTANCE NORTH-WEST THUNDERSLEY NO CREDIBLE 5 YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY	Justified, Consistent with national policy		THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL POLICY. IT DOESNT MEET THE HOUSING TARGET FOR CASTLE POINT. SITE SELECTION IGNORES GREENBELT/GREY BELT AGAINST NEW NPPF GUIDELINES THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN IS NOT JUSTIFIED AND THE 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 THUNDERSELY. NPPF GUIDELINES STATE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE DIRECTED AWAY FROM AREAS AT HIGHEST RISK OF FLOODING. SUDS MEASURES ARE NOT APPROPRIATE FOR CANVEY ISLANDS UNIQUE GEOGRAPHY AND	DRAFT DOCUMENT NEEDS TO BE LEGALLY COMPLAINT AND/OR SOUND INCLUDING ANY REVISED WORDING. ADD NORTH WEST THUNDERSLEY SITE 187Ha, A GREENBELT/GREY BELT/BROWNFIELD SITE OPTION FOR 7,500 HOMES REDUCE THE URBAN HOUSING TARGET TO 3,500 FROM 6,200 WITH CANVEY AT 1,050	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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 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.	Green/Grey Belt		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
												DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE. 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 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, 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. 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Flooding 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0783-0001	Individual	TONY	Empson			Yes	SP3	No	FAILED TO CONSIDER STRATEGIC ALTERNATIVES FOR INSTANCE NORTH-WEST THUNDERSLEY NO CREDIBLE 5 YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY ALSO I CANNOT SEE ANY EVIDENCE OF THE DRAINAGE BEING UPGRADED SINCE THE 2014 FLOODS WHEN THEY WERE DEEMED IN NEED OF UPGRADE I CANNOT SEE EVIDENCE OF FLOOD CHECKS IN WEST CANVEY SPECIFICALLY WHERE THE BULK OF HOUSING IS PLANNED	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL POLICY. IT DOESNT MEET THE HOUSING TARGET FOR CASTLE POINT. SITE SELECTION IGNORES GREENBELT/GREY BELT AGAINST NEW NPPF GUIDELINES THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN IS NOT JUSTIFIED AND THE 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 THUNDERSELY. NPPF GUIDELINES STATE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE DIRECTED AWAY FROM AREAS AT HIGHEST RISK OF FLOODING. SUDS MEASURES ARE NOT APPROPRIATE FOR CANVEY ISLANDS UNIQUE GEOGRAPHY AND	DRAFT DOCUMENT NEEDS TO BE LEGALLY COMPLAINT AND/OR SOUND INCLUDING ANY REVISED WORDING. ADD NORTH WEST THUNDERSLEY SITE 187Ha, A GREENBELT/GREY BELT/BROWNFIELD SITE OPTION FOR 7,500 HOMES REDUCE THE URBAN HOUSING TARGET TO 3,500 FROM 6,200 WITH CANVEY AT 1,050 TOTAL HOUSING TARGET 11,000	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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 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.	Green/Grey Belt	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
												DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE. 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 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, 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. 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
																					Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Flooding 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0784-0001	Individual	Tracey	Mann			Yes	SP3	No	Failed to use Standard Methodology to calculate the number of homes required in Castle Point as directed by The Housing Minister in June.		Justified, Consistent with national policy		The Draft Local Plan is not consistent with National Policy and doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/Greybelt against new NPPF guidelines, Ignores NPPF guidelines that development should be directed away from areas at high risk of flooding particularly considering Canvey's low elevation, high groundwater levels, tidal influence and severe drainage issues.	Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha which is a greenbelt/greybelt /brownfield site option for 7500 homes. It is a sustainable and accessible site and wouldn't undermine the wider function of the green belt.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting standard method Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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.		N
									Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.				The Draft Local Plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is based and predetermined towards a 'no greenbelt build policy'. Site selection is based on the 'over development of Brownfield sites', Not considered all sites by excluding North West Thundersley. Ignores NPPF guidelines that should be directed away from areas at high risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey's unique	Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. The island has unique constraints around infrastructure with only two roads available to get off the island and you have to go to one single roundabout (Waterside Farm) before you can access either road. Gridlock and permanent traffic queues are common now, the island has no capacity for more cars.					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 deliver this scale of growth in Castle Point.			
													The Draft Local Plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is based and predetermined towards a 'no greenbelt build policy'. Site selection is based on the 'over development of Brownfield sites', Not considered all sites by excluding North West Thundersley. Ignores NPPF guidelines that should be directed away from areas at high risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey's unique	Total housing (including NW Thundersley)= 11,000 homes					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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a		

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
										geography and poor drainage structure. The 3316 houses urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents at risk in the event of an emergency evacuation due to the flood risk and the danger posed by the proximity of the COMAH sites.								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 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 housing topic paper.			
																		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			

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
																					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 parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. 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. Flooding on Canvey Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is substantially defended from			

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
																			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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		
0785-0001	Individual	Karen	White		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Effective	The amount of homes planned for Canvey Island will not be effective as simply no infrastructure to cope with that increase of population to the island.	Modifications necessary are a complete change of highways giving a direct route to A13/A130. Maybe a flyover to A130. This will help the population already living here.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Third Road onto Canvey Infrastructure	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. Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).		
0788-0001	Individual	John	Murphy		Yes	SP3	No	Majority of planned building in the borough on Canvey Island flood plains. Minimal planned for better suited locations. No improvement plans for ingress / egress to the island which is always gridlocked in rush hours and the whole area grids to a halt	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy			No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Flood Risk on Canvey Third Road onto Canvey	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 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 onto 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. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								for even a minor accident, roadworks etc.									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 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0791-0001	Individual	Kelly	Brown			Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy		The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. It doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. Site selection ignores greenbelt/greybelt 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 of highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure (it cannot cope now!). Over 3000 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with	North West Thundersley site, 187Ha, a greenbelt/brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 homes from 6200, with Canvey at 1050.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting standard method Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once 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
										emergency evacuation procedures. It is not just the drainage infrastructure that is an issue on Canvey, it already struggles with the current weight of traffic - access routes just cannot support this level of building.								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 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 housing topic paper.			
																		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			

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
																					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 parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. 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. Flooding on Canvey Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is substantially defended from			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0794-0001	Individual	Daniel	Adams			Yes	SP3	Yes				- The plan is sound but: - there's insufficient additional housing planned to meet national policy. - there are no plans to upgrade highways network to accommodate planned housing. - The North West Thundersley area should therefore be considered for large scale housing so as to help meet national policy levels. This area is the least useable green belt of any in the borough - so could be re-classified for housing. Access to the highways network could be made around the Fairglen Interchange, thereby reducing any extra traffic flow across more urban, already congested parts of the borough.	- The North West Thundersley area should be considered for large scale housing so as to help meet national policy levels. This area is the least useable green belt of any in the borough - so could be re-classified for housing. Access to the highways network could be made around the Fairglen Interchange, thereby reducing any extra traffic flow across more urban, already congested parts of the borough.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting standard method Transport North West Thundersley	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 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. 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 Essex Local	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
																							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. 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0795-0001	Individual	Kevin	Hughes			Yes	SP3	No	This is green belt, rebranded to suit your purposes. There is also no supportive infrastructure, which I am sure the govt said must be built to facilitate the scale of build and impact	No	Effective, Consistent with national policy	The govt said that, even if you conveniently decide to rebrand green to grey belt, it does not mean you just go ahead and build on it. Also, even Essex water suppliers have challenged the soundness of this. Conveniently ignore which of these you like. I fear anything said of residential concern will be ignored, but hey, you were told! Also, this is very disproportionate, happy to have more homes, but putting a massive percentage in one flood risky area is -. Unfair and 2. Short term 3. Shows lack of thinking in location support, schools, medical capability, no traffic consultation with highways agency, serious impact on the existing residents ability to get on and off the island	Put water and sewage infrastructure in place to ensure existing annual water plain rise impact are not made worse. Every year in Charfleets / Dutch Village area you have to bring in drainage experts to reduce the road and home flooding. Also, road infrastructure is already significantly challenged. Even 1000 new homes is at least 1000 new cars, the island will not cope. But I suspect decision makers are not personally impacted. Other mainland areas can cope much better with high volume build. They should take most of the hit	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		No building on Green/Grey Belt Infrastructure Flood Risk on Canvey	No building on Green/Grey Belt This plan does not include any development on Green/Grey Belt land. 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, 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 Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above. 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
																			Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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.		
0801-0001	Individual	Peggy-Jane	Smith		Yes	SP3	No	My concern is that the government, will require more houses built.	No	Consistent with national policy	As before, I am concerned that the government will require more houses. Although I agree with the council that we have huge constraints within C.P. and I also agree that we should avoid building on greenbelt, I am concerned that certain greenbelt hasn't been fully accessed in the		No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting standard method North West Thundersley	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	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
										disastrous eventually we are forced to do so. (build on greenbelt). I think more attention should have been given to land North West Thundersley. This land will have the least overall impact on the majority of residents. It has a planned road infrastructure in place by E.CC. I think more work needs to be done to access its viability.								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. 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0802-0001	Individual	Kathleen	Murton			Yes	SP3	No	Failure to consider alternatives, i.e. 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, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point and site selection ignores green belt/grey belt against new NPPF guidelines. The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a 'no green belt build policy'. Site selection is based on 'over development of Brownfield sites'. Not considered all sites, no Green belt/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 the unique geography and drainage infrastructure of Canvey Island. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes put residents in the East at risk with emergency	Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha, a Green belt/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.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Infrastructure Transport Third Road onto Canvey Flood Risk on Canvey Green/Grey belt Alternative sites	Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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. 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	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
												evacuation procedures.									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 make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. 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 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. Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance 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
																					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 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. Alternative Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0808-0001	Individual	Gary	Faux			Yes	SP3	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	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 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 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	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																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														
													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																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
														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.								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 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
0809-0001	Individual	Susan	Faux			Yes	SP3	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	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 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 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	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
														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.								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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD3		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0811-0001	Individual	Mari on	Andrew			Yes	SP3	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	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	B - not representing an organisation	No five year housing land supplyNorth West ThundersleyGreen/Grey BeltSupports HAD2Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	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, 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 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 housing topic paper.North West ThundersleyNorth 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/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																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
													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 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																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.							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		
0812-0001	Individual	Janet	THORNE		Yes	SP3	Yes		No			There is no way Canvey island can have over 3000 homes built there!!!! Poor infrastructure, risk of flooding and only 1 way off. Traffic is horrendous as it is!!!!		No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Infrastructure Transport Third Road onto Canvey Flood Risk on Canvey	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex includes wider local	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
																					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. 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 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. 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.		
0813-0001	Individual	Alan	Spiller		Yes	SP3	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.	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 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	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
												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 suitor development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes puts the Hadleigh Farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respite urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of							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 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. 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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, protecting our farmland and 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 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.										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 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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD3	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0814-0001	Individual	Michelle	Ford			Yes	SP3	No	Has not considered strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible 5 year housing land supply.	No	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 overdevelopment of Brownfield sites. Not considered all sites, no greenbelt/grey belt sites added with the exclusion of North West Thundersley. NFFP guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for the unique geography of Canvey Island and the drainage infrastructure. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey are not resident led. Canvey West homes will put residents in the east at risk with	Add North West Thundersley site 187Ha, 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	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting standard method Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
										emergency evacuation procedures.									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 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 housing topic paper.		
																		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			

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
																					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 parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. 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. Flooding on Canvey Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is substantially defended from			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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. 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0816-0001	Individual	Kathryn	Jones			Yes	SP3	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 Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space,	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 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 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	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																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
														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 platform 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 ad 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																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										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 n Sea.								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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD3			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0818-0001	Individual	Sally	Holman			Yes	SP3	No	Failure to consider strategic alternatives, for example NW Thundersley NO credible 5 year housing land supply	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	This is NOT consistent with National Policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point & the site selection totally ignores Greenbelt / Grey belt against new NPPF guidelines. It's not justified, the site selection strategy is biased & mostly towards a "no greenbelt build policy", it's based solely on the "over development of Brownfield sites" has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Greybelt sites added, and the exclusion of the NW Thundersley Site. I DO TOTALLY agree with the 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 & connectivity, protection as an open space,	ADD NW 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 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 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	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																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																
														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 development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways & traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland & wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, & use grey belt FIRST. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh & the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with NO housing development EVER																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										on this farmland site and I really hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect & enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh & Leigh on Sea.								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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD3			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0820-0001	Individual	h	keeble			Yes	SP3	No	This plan has been forced despite the Governments rationale being totally unsound. Present house building is now far in excess of that imposed by the Government and has far outstripped population increase. Consequently the number of houses now being planned is just pure speculation by developers . Not once has anyone attempted to understand the very unique restrictions and constraints of the geography of the area. It quite	No	Consistent with national policy	Please see 2b.	It can,t be legally sound because of @b.	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		No Homes too many constraints COMAH safety concerns	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 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. Constraints The evidence base that supports the plan has extensive information on the constraints within the borough and if appropriate how they can be mitigated against. COMAH safety concerns As set out in Plan paragraph 8.28 ‘Both port facilities are	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

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’.

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0822-0001	Individual	Trevor	Shaw			Yes	SP3	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	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	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 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 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	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 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.								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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD3			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0988-0001	Agent			Persimmon Homes Ltd c/o Pegasus Group	Yes	SP3	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	2. Policy SP3 – Meeting Development Needs The Housing Requirement 2.1. The new Plan confirms that the starting point for assessing local housing need is the standard methodology, which establishes a housing requirement for Castle Point of 686 dwellings per annum, equating to 11,662 homes over the Plan period. This is agreed as being the most recent figure, and it is welcomed that the Council recognises this is a variable figure due to changes in affordable housing ratios and housing stock which inform the figure. 2.2. However, this is only the starting point but not the correct housing requirement figure as no buffer has been applied. The NPPF 2024 requires the application of a buffer of a minimum 5%. Given the context in Castle Point of a poor housing			Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Doesn't meet Standard Method Housing number or correctly apply buffer. The Council's evidence does not support the growth strategy set out in SP3 of providing for only half of the housing growth required by the Standard Method. Approach to Green Belt conflicts with NPPF para 146 and the Council's own Green Belt Assessment (July 2025), Disagrees with rejection of GB5 suggesting flawed criteria. The Transport Assessment process for potential Green Belt allocations has not been undertaken in a robust, appropriate and sound manner. This casts considerable doubt on the Council stating transport impacts as a reason for not releasing any Green Belt land at all for development. The Housing Topic Paper refers to the "Essex Parking Guidance	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. Within the NPPF Paragraph 11 section b (a) and (ii) give an acknowledgement of circumstances in which national policy does not expect Standard Method outcomes to be met in full. The Sustainability Appraisal (July 2025) provides the evidence of the negative impacts arising from an increase in the housing requirement. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>Duty to Cooperate</u> Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of	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				
										delivery record, and given the identified supply for the new Plan is wholly from the Urban Area, this buffer should really be at least 10%. A robust and appropriate buffer is important to allow for a sufficient supply of sites that factors in potential under-delivery of the allocated capacity, or the slow delivery of allocated sites. This in turn ensures there is no risk of not being able to meet the minimum local housing need. 2.3. Notwithstanding the above, the Policy SP3 seeks to deliver only 6,196 homes over the 17 year plan period, or 364 dwellings per annum. The new Plan provides various reasons for being unable to meet local housing need in full. The first is that it would “destroy large tracks [sic] of Green Belt, including land which strongly contributes to the Green Belt purposes”. 2.4. This reason conflicts with NPPF												Connectivity Map” as an indicator for the sustainable connectivity of a site. This is quite evidently not the purpose of the mapping produced by Essex County Council, which is for the purpose of guiding parking standards. The mapping reflects the current situation, rather than accounting for the opportunities available for site permeability and connectivity which would increase accessibility of the site to services and facilities. The use of this mapping in this manner by the Council is therefore not appropriate or robust. Notwithstanding this, the mapping shows that the site has areas of connectivity that ranges from High to Low. The new Plan suggests that the local plan evidence base demonstrates that the release of Green Belt land to meet local	Common Ground. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 146. The exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt land have been established, with the Council affirming that the Urban Area is insufficient to accommodate local housing needs in full. Paragraph 146 confirms that, where exceptional circumstances are established, Green Belt land should be released “unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt.” 2.5. This reason also ignores the Council’s own Green Belt Assessment (July 2025), which identifies areas of Green Belt that do not strongly contribute to the Green Belt purposes. Taking Land West of Benfleet (GB5) as an example, the Green Belt Assessment confirms that the overall performance of this parcel against the							housing need in full is not feasible. This is disputed Argues that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan confirms that infrastructure needs arising from a higher level of housing growth can be met. The Housing Topic Paper seeks to make the argument that allocating Green Belt (greenfield) sites to increase the housing requirement would reduce the attractiveness of regeneration opportunities on brownfield sites in the urban area. However, the developers interested in developing each type will be different. Market Capacity: There is no evidence that there is a risk of “overallocation” of housing in a constrained market area. Ultimately, developers would not be promoting sites for development if there was no market demand for the homes, and they would certainly not take				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												Green Belt purposes is “Moderate”, and that if the parcel were to be released, “that it would be unlikely to significantly harm the performance of the wider Green Belt owing to its limited size relative to the wider Green Belt and its position to the very west of the plan area”. This is just one example, but clearly show that the Council has not taken a sound approach in determining that there should be no release of Green Belt despite the existence of exceptional circumstances. 2.6. Another reason that is given is “protecting and enhancing the natural environment set out in policy SP1”. However, this has not been assessed through the Habitat Regulations Assessment and no evidence is provided that the release of Green Belt would lead to greater impacts than the current strategy. A straightforward presumption					on the significant costs associated with preparing planning applications. Five Year Supply: Suggests that at the point of adoption (if this version of the Plan were to ever reach adoption), the Council would not be able to demonstrate a five year housing supply. This is not in compliance with the NPPF or the NPPG. Suggest a lack of a housing trajectory Windfalls: SP3 identifies a windfall allowance of 45 dwellings per annum. The Housing Topic Paper clarifies this is based on an average of the homes delivered on sites of less than five dwellings over the period 2013 to 2025. However, this does not take into account the difficulties that are currently being faced by the small and medium housebuilders who deliver this level of housing.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										cannot be made that a greenfield site will have a higher biodiversity value than a brownfield site. A greenfield site in agricultural use can have a very low biodiversity baseline, while a brownfield site could contain open mosaic habitat which is high value, irreplaceable habitat. 2.7. Additionally, Policy SP1 conflates Green Belt with Green Infrastructure. Green Belt is an urban containment policy. It is not an environmental protection on the same level as Local Wildlife Sites, Ancient Woodland, or designated public open space (which are referred to in SP1 alongside Green Belt). This is demonstrated in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025) which demonstrates that GB5 is not constrained by any environmental designations (footnote 7 constraints), and is not identified as an area of particular importance for							Looking instead at the period between 2020 to 2025, the average delivery on small sites has been only 36 dwellings per year. Indeed, in 2023/24 only 26 dwellings were delivered, and this fell further still to 15 dwellings in 2024/25. The Housing Topic Paper also refers to the work undertaken for the SLAA a supporting a windfall allowance of 45 dwellings per annum. However, only a cursory look at the “Potential Windfall Sites” Missue with this approach. Two of these potential sites are located on London Road. The first, at 32 London Road, is a parking area to the rear of a block of affordable homes – with the car park clearly labelled “for residents”. The second site is further to the east, at 80 London Road, and is again a parking court for residents. Thirdly, Policy B9 – South				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 in the LNRS. The Topic Paper does indicate that GB5 includes Open Space. However, this is only because the Council has expanded the GB5 boundaries to include the adjoining Arthur Stevens' playing fields and Romsey Road Allotments. Persimmon is not promoting these parcels of land for development, and requests they be removed from the GB5 site boundary for all assessment and other purposes – in line with the site boundaries shown on the “Potentially Unconstrained Green Belt Map”. 2.8. Another reason given is “potential impact to heritage assets”. The evidence base contains no Borough-wide Heritage Assessments, only two site-specific assessments. Again therefore, no evidence is provided to support this reasoning. 2.9. Having confirmed that there are parcels of Green Belt land						Benfleet Playing Fields seeks to masterplan as a multi-functional green space. The above examples demonstrate that even the Council's reduced housing target is unlikely to be achieved. This is to be expected when a strategy relies solely on brownfield sites. For an effective housing strategy, a range of sites – small, strategic, greenfield, brownfield – need to be identified. In summary, there is limited technical justification for the dismissal of alternative spatial strategy options and previously considered Green Belt development sites that might have enabled the Borough to meet its housing need in full. There is no clear demonstration that all reasonable alternatives, including those that would meet the full housing need, have been			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 the Borough that are not constrained by environmental, ecological or open space designations. Highway impacts and sustainable access are given as a further reason for not releasing Green Belt land development. The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Sites Assessment (July 2025) which has conducted site-specific assessments of all promoted Green Belt sites. The Assessment makes conclusions on the sustainability of each site. However, the results that have been reached are questionable. Again, the assessment for GB5 is used as an example to highlight Persimmon's concerns for the wider assessment process. 2.10. First is the development quantum of GB5. The site boundary has been drawn to include playing fields and allotments located on the north-western boundary.							adequately assessed and tested. The new Plan is not positively prepared, not justified, and not compliant with national policy. There has also been no consideration of the legal requirement of opportunities for unmet need to be accommodate through the Duty to Co-operate. It therefore fails on all the soundness tests.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										Persimmon has no intention to include existing open space within the development boundary. No regard appears to have been had of existing development within the site, some of which is to be retained. The application of a gross density of 40 dwellings per hectare is also not accurate, as it does not account for the delivery of policy requirements such as open space, non-residential development etc. within the site. A development quantum of 1,308 dwellings is quoted; the above demonstrates that this is highly inaccurate and unrealistic. Based on the site that is actually promoted by Persimmon, a quantum of up to 850 dwellings is more realistic for the purpose of undertaking assessment work.											
										2.11. This use of a wrong development quantum means the trip generation modelling and development impacts 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
										inaccurate and cannot be relied upon. This needs to be reviewed and updated by the Council. 2.12. Notwithstanding this critical error, the Assessment goes on to conclude that there is limited potential for modal shift to sustainable transport. Persimmon disagrees with this assessment. The site is within easy walking distance (between 5 and 15 minutes) of several existing education, health and leisure facilities and bus stops, with the Tarpots Town Centre being at most a 20 minute walk from the site. There are already food connections to the existing footway network with opportunities existing for further enhancements to be made, particularly on Jotmans Lane. The same is applicable to cycle accessibility, with opportunities available to connect to existing and planned strategic cycle routes which would											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required									
												provide another transport mode to local facilities, including crucially Benfleet Train Station. 2.13. Lastly, the Council's Assessment concludes that bus access would be poor. Which seems to be based on a conclusion that direct access on to the A130 Canvey Way is not feasible. Even if that was the case, the size of the development proposed would justify the diversion of existing bus services into the site, or the introduction of a new bus service to serve new residents. One potential diversion could be via Wavertree Road and Jotmans Lane, which would not require an access onto Canvey Way. This would though be a positive measure that would encourage residents to travel by bus; making the service more attractive by bringing the route into the site itself. 2.14. The above demonstrates that the 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
												Assessment process for potential Green Belt allocations has not been undertaken in a robust, appropriate and sound manner. This casts considerable doubt on the Council stating transport impacts as a reason for not releasing any Green Belt land at all for development. 2.15. The Housing Topic Paper refers to the “Essex Parking Guidance Connectivity Map” as an indicator for the sustainable connectivity of a site. This is quite evidently not the purpose of the mapping produced by Essex County Council, which is for the purpose of guiding parking standards. The mapping reflects the current situation, rather than accounting for the opportunities available for site permeability and connectivity which would increase accessibility of the site to services and facilities. The use of this mapping in this manner by the Council is therefore									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 appropriate or robust. Notwithstanding this, the mapping shows that the site has areas of connectivity that ranges from High to Low. 2.16. The new Plan suggests that the local plan evidence base demonstrates that the release of Green Belt land to meet local housing need in full is not feasible. However, the above has demonstrated that this is not the case. This is also agreed in the Council's own Housing Capacity Topic Paper – in section 13, the Paper confirms that while much of the Borough's Green Belt is subject to constraints, there are 17 Green Belt sites which are unconstrained and therefore suitable for consideration for development. This list includes GB5, GB2 and GB12, all of which are also identified through the Green Belt Assessment (July 2025) as potential Grey Belt. The sites therefore meet the sequential approach required																	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										by paragraph 148 – the exceptional circumstances for Green Belt development has been established, and there are Grey Belt sites available which can be prioritised for development ahead of the remainder of the Green Belt. 2.17. The Housing Topic Paper clearly agrees, confirming that the three sites (among others) can be taken forward for further consideration, albeit with a reduced area for GB2 to address heritage constraints. Despite this clear assessment of there being no overarching constraints, the Housing Topic Paper makes no conclusion that there is the ability to provide additional homes on housing delivery. The Paper concludes with a discussion of other considerations, but these are not presented as being sufficient evidence that development on Green Belt land is not feasible. These 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				
											considerations include: • Infrastructure: The Infrastructure Delivery Plan confirms that infrastructure needs arising from a higher level of housing growth can be met. The Housing Topic Paper suggests the need arising for a new primary school may be a constraint if a higher housing requirement is imposed, however the Council will be well aware that GB5 has been promoted with the ability to deliver non-residential uses, which could take the form of a primary school. This is therefore not a robust argument against increasing the housing requirement. • Regeneration: The Housing Topic Paper seeks to make the argument that allocating Green Belt (greenfield) sites to increase the housing requirement would reduce the attractiveness of regeneration opportunities on brownfield sites in the urban area. However, this																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														misses the point that these are two very different forms of sites and the developers interested in developing each type will be different. It is also not the case that greenfield sites are automatically easier to develop with less infrastructure requirements compared to brownfield sites. The development management policies in the new Plan demonstrate well the increased requirements that are placed on greenfield sites, such as open space, affordable housing and sustainable transport provision. In addition, a strategic Green Belt site such as GB5 will have its own associated infrastructure requirements – to be delivered at considerable cost. • Market Capacity: As with the above, there is no evidence that there is a risk of “overallocation” of housing in a constrained market area. Ultimately, developers would not be promoting										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 for development if there was no market demand for the homes, and they would certainly not take on the significant costs associated with preparing planning applications. 2.18. The Housing Topic Paper makes no strong argument that the above considerations carry sufficiently weight to disregard all Green Belt sites entirely. 2.19. The Council could point to the Sustainability Appraisal (July 2025) as providing the evidence of the negative impacts arising from an increase in the housing requirement. However, the Housing Topic Paper makes no reference to these impacts, so there is a disconnect between the two documents, calling into question the soundness of the evidence base. 2.20. Even if it were accepted that there could be some negative impacts arising from 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
														release of Green Belt land. The negative impacts of not releasing Green Belt, and so not meeting housing needs in full, also need to be considered. Again, the answer is in the Council's own evidence base, specifically the Equality Impact Assessment (July 2025). This clearly sets out the negative impacts that would be had on the economic and housing prospects for young people, the negative impacts on community infrastructure requirements, particularly for the Jewish Community, the negative impacts on those looking for affordable homes, for starter homes, for accessible homes, or just homes in general. These homes cannot be sufficiently provided through the Council's current spatial strategy. The Equality Impact Assessment conclusion is clear: "Ensure that the housing needs of the borough is met and have										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										awareness of how the provision of housing can impact those with [protected] characteristics”. 2.21. The Council has provided no evidence that these negative impacts associated with the current spatial strategy of not providing for local housing needs in full have been considered in the balance against potential negative impacts associated with Green Belt release. The above discussion has shown that there are deficiencies in the robustness of the Council’s assessment process for Green Belt sites, with GB5 used as just one example. The Council’s own evidence shows that there are unconstrained Green Belt sites, like GB5, that could be released for development without leading to significant impact on the purposes of the wider Green Belt, or other impacts. This aligns with the conclusions of previous development plans											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
										prepared by this same Council, which have allocated GB5 and other Green Belt sites for development (and those allocations have been supported by the Examining Inspector).												
										2.22. In conclusion, Persimmon Homes highlights that the Council's evidence does not support the growth strategy set out in SP3 of providing for only half of the housing growth required by the Standard Method. There are clearly opportunities available to increase the housing requirement, and to achieve a sound Local Plan the Council must demonstrate that it has explored all opportunities to maximise growth in seeking to achieve local housing need (which itself is the minimum housing requirement that a development plan should be aiming for). Persimmon Homes strongly recommends that the Council do not submit the new												

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
										Plan for Examination until it has been reviewed in line with the above, updated and subject to a further consultation. It is considered that the current form of the new Plan is very unlikely to be found sound due to the deficiencies in SP3. The Supply 2.23. Notwithstanding the above discussion on the robustness of the current proposed housing requirement. It is acknowledged that the level of delivery proposed in the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft would be an increase in supply over current (poor) levels of delivery. However, this is a stepped housing delivery. SP3(4) indicates that even this reduced housing requirement will only be met on an annual basis in the final seven years of the Plan period, with only 209 homes per annum allocated for delivery in the first five years, and 253 homes per annum													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														in years 6-10. Meaning at the point of adoption (if this version of the Plan were to ever reach adoption), the Council would not be able to demonstrate a five year housing supply. This is not in compliance with the NPPF or the NPPG.										
														2.24. No detailed trajectory has been provided (for both new allocations and existing commitments) to demonstrate the above. This should have been made available now given this is a Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Plan to allow for interrogation. This is necessary for a sound and robust housing supply figure.										
														2.25. Paragraph 6.51 states that the stepped housing trajectory reflects the certainty the Council has in the delivery of sites, with sites that are less certain being pushed to later in the Plan period. The evidence behind this reasoning must be shared, as any site where there is a reasonable level 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					
										uncertainty around deliverability should not be included in the new Plan as a potential allocation at all. 2.26. Indeed, there are questions around the deliverability of the allocations that have been identified by the Council. Persimmon Homes highlights a couple of examples below, but it is for the Council to ensure that robust evidence is provided on the deliverability of all allocations – which includes a housing trajectory. 2.31. SP3 identifies a windfall allowance of 45 dwellings per annum. The Housing Topic Paper clarifies this is based on an average of the homes delivered on sites of less than five dwellings over the period 2013 to 2025. However, this does not take into account the difficulties that are currently being faced by the small and medium housebuilders who deliver this level 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
										housing. Looking instead at the period between 2020 to 2025, the average delivery on small sites has been only 36 dwellings per year. Indeed, in 2023/24 only 26 dwellings were delivered, and this fell further still to 15 dwellings in 2024/25.											
										2.32. The Housing Topic Paper also refers to the work undertaken for the SLAA a supporting a windfall allowance of 45 dwellings per annum. However, only a cursory look at the “Potential Windfall Sites Maps” reveals the issue with this approach. Two of these potential sites are located on London Road. The first, at 32 London Road, is a parking area to the rear of a block of affordable homes – with the car park clearly labelled “for residents”. The second site is further to the east, at 80 London Road, and is again a parking court for residents. Thirdly, Policy B9 – South Benfleet Playing Fields seeks to masterplan 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						
												multi-functional green space. 2.33. It must be emphasised this is based on only a cursory review of the mapping, but the issue is clear. 2.34. The above examples demonstrate that even the Council’s reduced housing target is unlikely to be achieved. This is to be expected when a strategy relies solely on brownfield sites. For an effective housing strategy, a range of sites – small, strategic, greenfield, brownfield – need to be identified. 2.36. In summary, there is limited technical justification for the dismissal of alternative spatial strategy options and previously considered Green Belt development sites that might have enabled the Borough to meet its housing need in full. There is no clear demonstration that all reasonable alternatives, including those that would meet the full housing															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
													need, have been adequately assessed and tested. The new Plan is not positively prepared, not justified, and not compliant with national policy. There has also been no consideration of the legal requirement of opportunities for unmet need to be accommodate through the Duty to Co-operate. It therefore fails on all the soundness tests.											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0825-0001	Individual	Jayne	Hodges			Yes	SP3	No		Justified, Consistent with national policy	There is no credible 5 year housing land supply There has been no strategic alternatives such as the North West Thundersley area considered	No	The draft plan is not consistent with national policy. This does not meet the housing target for Castlepoint. Site selection ignores Greenbelt/Greybelt against new NPPF guidelines Draft local plan is not justified. The site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a non greenbelt build policy. Site selection is based on the over development of brownfield sites. This has not considered all sites no green or grey belt land added with the exclusion of NW Thundersley, NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas of highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Add the North West Site 187Ha 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 11,000	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting standard method Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
											evacuation procedures.										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 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 housing topic paper.		
																					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		

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
																					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 parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. 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. Flooding on Canvey Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is substantially defended from			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0826-0001	Individual	Patricia	Walker			Yes	SP3	No	This plan has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersly. Why not? This is not a credible 5 year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy		This planet is NOT consistent with national policy. It does NOT meet the housing target for Castlepoint. The site selection ignores greenbelt/greybelt against NPPF guidelines. The site selection strategy is biased and pre-determined towards a 'no greenbelt build policy'. It is solely based on the 'over development of brownfield sites. It has not considered ALL sites, with no greenbelt/greybelt sites added, and the exclusion of North West Thundersly site, which happens to be the perfect location for development! I do, however, do totally agree with Had2 policy for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states that this site is extremely important for environmental recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural farming activities, nature conservation, SSS1, Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity.	You must add North West Thundersly site to the Plan, as 187Ha as a greenbelt/greybelt site option for 7 500 homes. You must reduce the urban housing target from 6,200 to 3,500, with Canvey at 1,050 homes, and Hadleigh at 305. This is a total of 11,305, which is the amount specified by government.	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 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 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	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				
													It provides protection as an open space, promoting our heritage site, Hadleigh Castle, and whatever is planned for this site for the future, it does not have a significant impact on the landscape nor the greenbelt. I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this greenbelt as NOT suitable for development, but the unsound Local Plan for only 6,200 homes puts the Hadleigh Farmland site (GB8), at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl. IT IS A BUFFER ZONE. The effect on highways, traffic, and lack of infrastructure, protecting our Farmland and wildlife are paramount. Development on this Farmland would be out of character, with loss of open space, heritage, archeology sites, and historic links. Greenbelt land MUST be used first. Any development on this site affects													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. 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, 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support the Had2 Policy with absolutely NO housing development EVER on the Farmland. I am hoping that the Salvation Army agree with taking this direction. We need a C6 Policy for this Farmland site, which is the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD3			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.		2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0827-0001	Individual	Sonia	Looker			Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternative s..ie North West Thundersley. No credible fiveyear land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Not consistent with national policy.not meeting housing target for Castle Point ..site not taking Greenbelt or Greybelt into consideration...new guidelines... Lack of Infrastructure and for traffic....in this area gridlock		Greenbelt ..Greybelt ..Brownfield site look at North West Thundersley. housing target too high needs reducing massively in this area...	No	Not Answered	Not Answered			Not meeting standard method No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Strategic alternatives Green/Grey Belt Infrastructure		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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once 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
																						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 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 housing topic paper. 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			

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
																					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 parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. 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. Strategic Alternatives All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and 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
																		Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).			
0828-0002	Individual	Keith	Broadhead		Yes	SP3	Yes	The difficulties of applying Government methodology for the whole of England, to the real situation pertaining to Castle-Point, is readily apparent when considered with the property	No	Justified		New planning permissions should require off-road parking for at least two vehicles. Grass verges are ruined by Illegal parking on kerbs or pavements and offenders should be effectively deterred. Pavements should have no sudden sharp changes of level as in Castle Lane. Licences (min £500) should be required for	No	Not Answered			No need for housing in hadleigh North West Thundersley	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	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
												Utilities and others wishing to destroy the road surface. With 50% refundable on inspection and satisfactory reinstatement. Although further housing might be considered desirable by some there is absolutely no immediate NEED in Hadleigh.							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. 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								As a long term objective the North West Thundersley proposal could be reconsidered (see Reg.18 Draft) for future residential development when the NEED and COST can be fully justified.														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0829-0001	Individual	Reece	Marshall			Yes	SP3	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 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 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency	Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha, 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.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Not meeting standard method Lack of Five Year Housing Land Supply Green/Grey Belt not considered North West Thundersley Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency Evacuation Concerns	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once 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
											evacuation procedures.										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 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 housing topic paper. 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		

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
																					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 parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. 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. Flooding on Canvey Whilst Canvey is at risk of flooding, it is not functional flood plain as it is substantially defended from			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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. 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/			
0832-0001	Individual	Graham	Frost		Yes	SP3	No	None of these guidance points appears to have been adhered to:The Castle Point Plan Draft should have been prepared in accordance with the Council's latest Local Development	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Non-sustainable proposal which is imbalanced with the surrounding areas. The cart has literally been put before the horse with no infrastructure proposals to cope with the proposed demands. I'm afraid it would appear to me that our Councillors are looking somewhat amateurish and	Build a third access road towards Thurrock before anything else.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Infrastructure Third Road onto Canvey	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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	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
								boundary matters, known as the Duty to Cooperate. The Castle Point Plan Draft should comply with all relevant laws including the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
0833-0001	Individual	Gill	Skelton			Yes	SP3	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 Green Belt/Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection 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 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 conversation, SSSI, Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Greybelt, 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 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 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 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	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
										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.								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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD3			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0834-0003	Individual	Gary	Luckman			Yes	SP3	Not Answered		Not Answered			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. 1. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. 2. Utilise a section of the top of the Playing Fields (Richmond Park) for the construction of new community health facilities. 3. Utilise the land adjacent to the A130 between Sadlers Farm for affordable housing and build it into the addition of North West Thundersley site (see 1 above), together with additional access roads for housing behind Tarpots and adjoining Manor Trading Estate. Reduce the urban housing target for Canvey. Total housing target of 12,000.	No	Not Answered		A	Not meeting standard method North West Thundersley Strategic alternatives Green/Grey Belt 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 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. 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	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
																						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 parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. 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. Strategic Alternatives All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).			
0835-0001	Individual	Dean	Isbell		Yes	SP3	No	There are much larger of areas of land that could be used to make these plans sound. Canvey Island is already over populated and over burdened by traffic and the lack of infrastructure. There are large areas of Land in the	No	Positively prepared	Not enough investment or investigation has taken place. The committee need to assess the infrastructure of the surrounding areas and road networks not just green belt.	Move housing away from Canvey look around the new A130 area towards Thundersley and Wickford.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Infrastructure on Canvey North West Thundersley	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies 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	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
								Thundersley area better suited and nearer road networks.										4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.			
0839-0001	Individual	Dawn	Hodgson		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Justified	The road infrastructure with not support the number of proposed of dwellings	Lower number of properties in keeping with the surroundings and more suitable for the infrastructure	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Roads and infrastructure not able to support the housing	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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.	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	
0842-0001	Individual	Andrea	Watt			Yes	SP3	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, 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 towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely 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. 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	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	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 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 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	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							
												planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt. The Had2 policy is about protecting this greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but an unsound plan 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 policy Had2 with no housing development ever on this farmland site. We need a C6 Policy for this farmland, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and																	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. 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, 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
													enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.									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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD3			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0843-0001	Individual	SUSAN	SCANLAN			Yes	SP3	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, 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 towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely 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. 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	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		No five year housing land supplyNorth West ThundersleyGreen/Grey BeltSupports HAD2Wants policy C6 for Hadleigh	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, 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 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 housing topic paper.North West ThundersleyNorth 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	
0844-0001	Individual	JACQUELINE	DAVIS			Yes	SP3	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, 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 towards a "no greenbelt build policy", is solely 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. 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	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 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 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	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
														between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.								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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD5		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0845-0001	Individual	Katy	Sumnerhayes			Yes	SP3	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	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		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 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 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.		N
																			North West 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
											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.									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 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
0846-0001	Individual	Gary	Strohmer			Yes	SP3	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	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		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 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 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.		N
																			North West 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
											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.							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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD7			
0858-0001	Individual	Carole	Sullivan		Yes	SP3	No	I am not a lawyer so I don't know whether it is legally compliant. However there is no don't know choice to tick. My laypersons opinion is that it is illegal in common law to force housing on local people where the population density is	No	Positively prepared, Justified	Please see my answer to question 2b above.	For the plan to be sound, it must include full details on how extra housing will not result in excessive additional road traffic eg by explaining how extra roads will be built to accommodate the extra traffic. It should also explain how additional traffic will not go onto surrounding roads so that the safety of families is assured. If it fails to do this it is unreasonable to expect local	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	No housing due to increased traffic	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 deliver this scale of growth in 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. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								already very high resulting in over busy roads and lack of services.					people to accept it. Extra housing should not be built on Scrub Lane because the road will not cope with the extra traffic. Better to build upwards on the A13 or even better go back to central government via our MP to explain why we can't take as much housing as they want. They can build on large country areas such as national parks instead where traffic is very light. Finally, increased traffic for local people in Castle Point is starting to make it impossible to visit places like national parks which are inaccessible to public transport. So spread the housing across the UK more equitably, including where richer people live such as the Cotswolds.							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. 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 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. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0862-0001	Individual	Peter	Thomas			Yes	SP3	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, it's solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites",has not considered all sites,with no Greenbelt/Grey Belts sites added,and 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,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	Add North West Thundersley site,187 Ha,as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt,Brownfield site option for7,000 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3,000 from 6200 with Canvey at 1050,and Hadleigh at 305. Total housings 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 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 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	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			
											on the landscape or 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 development, needing planning objections with respect to the urban sprawl, its a buffer zone, the effect on the highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure protecting our farmland and wildlife out of character, open spaces, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring areas of Leigh on sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site and hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction. We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the													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. 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, 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on sea.							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 the land is safeguarded by policy HAD7		
0866-0001	Individual	Margaret	Wigley		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It doesn't meet the policy required target and has not included any green or grey belt. It is biased towards an anti-build on the green belt agenda which has considered alternative sites with overdevelopment on brownfield sites especially on canvey	Consider the GB16 site as it could sustain a new village. It will help traffic and utilities already maxxed out in built up areas.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Not meeting housing targets Havent considered Green/Grey Belt North West Thundersley	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 deliver this scale of growth in 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
																					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. 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 policy GB2. 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.			
0867-0001	Individual	Vikki	Vafaee		Yes	SP3	No	The green belt isn't been considered for building. It's the council's policy to not build on it. So they've planned for over 3000 on Canvey Island, when they're fully aware of how awful the traffic is to get onto Canvey which backs up	No	Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Refusing to consider Green belt. Unjustly proposing huge numbers on Canvey Island to protect the green belt near the councillors own homes. Some of the plan where businesses are located will never be built on. They've just used those areas to bump up the numbers for building on brownfield sites.	Spread the homes to be built fairly throughout the borough.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Infrastructure Transport Third Road onto Canvey	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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	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
								beyond sadlers farm affecting traffic heading to Benfleet and beyond.													areas. Growth in Castle Point will facilitate the delivery of the proposals in the Local Transport Plan 4. 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 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0875-0001	Individual	Lin	Heys			Yes	SP3	No	Objection to the Draft Castle Point Local Plan for Canvey Island	No	Consistent with national policy			No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Infrastructure Transport Emergency Planning Flood Risk Third Road to Canvey Hazardous and Port Related Activities	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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. Emergency Planning The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ Flood Risk The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides an overview of flood risk within Castle Point and then provides site specific information for the allocations in the Castle Point Plan and provides recommendations on how to address any flood risk arising		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
							Healthcare : There are already insufficient numbers of GPs and healthcare facilities. No new provision is included to meet the increased demand.														
							3.2 Transport and Safety														
							The island has only one road for access and evacuation . This represents a serious risk to life in the event of flooding, a gas explosion, fire, or other emergencies. A plan that increases population without addressing this fundamental issue cannot be considered safe, effective,														

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’.

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0878-0001	Individual	Sarah	Howard			Yes	SP3	No	I do not believe the Castle Point Plan Draft is legally compliant for several important reasons, which I share as someone who has lived on Canvey Island for many years. - Lack of meaningful community engagement: From what I have seen, residents were not properly involved in the process. Major changes such as proposals to redevelop our health centres, police station, fire station, and libraries were not clearly explained to the public. For	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	From my perspective as a long-term resident, the Plan is not sound for these reasons: - Not Positively Prepared: Too many houses are planned for Canvey without the basic infrastructure to support them. We have waited decades for a third road, yet it is still missing. Even today, ambulances and fire engines often get stuck in traffic. Adding more housing without solving this first puts lives in danger. - Not Justified: The Council seems to be prioritising housing numbers over common sense. They are proposing to redevelop vital community facilities like our health centres, police station, and library. For many older residents, these are the places we rely on the most. Taking them away without proper replacements is unfair and short-sighted. - Not Effective: There is no clear evidence that many of these sites can	To make the Plan workable and safe for us, the following changes are needed: 1. A third road for Canvey (Policies IN1, SP1): No more large housing developments should be approved until a third access road is built and funded. 2. Protect community facilities (Policies HO1, SP1): Do not redevelop our fire station, health centres, library, or police station without guaranteed replacements. Older people especially depend on these services. 3. Flood and drainage protection (Policy CC1): Require proper flood and drainage studies before building. Systems like soakaways or infiltration trenches do not work here because of the tides, high groundwater, and reliance on pumps. Only drainage solutions proven to be safe for Canvey should be allowed. 4. Housing delivery (Policy HO1,	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Lack of meaningful engagement Duty to cooperate not met Flood Risk on Canvey LDS changes Deliverability Third road to Canvey Loss of Community Facilities	Lack of meaningful engagement 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. 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. 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 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. LDS Changes In order to be thorough in producing a robust evidence	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
							people of my age, these facilities are essential daily lifelines, and losing them without clear consultation goes against the Council's own rules on involving the community . - Duty to Cooperate not fulfilled: It is not clear that the Council has worked effectively with Essex County Council, the Environment Agency, or neighbouring local authorities . Issues such as flood defences, drainage, and the desperately needed third road off the			even be built. We are told there is no proof of landowner agreements or funding. The third access road is always delayed. Without these, the Plan is not deliverable. - Not Consistent with National Policy: The Plan allows homes in flood zones without proper protections, which goes against national rules for safe and sustainable development. It also proposes taking away important services we need for daily life, which contradicts national policy on supporting strong communities.		Appendix A): Reduce the overall plan period and housing numbers so infrastructure can keep up. New homes should only be built after improvements to roads, schools, and health services are in place. 5. Cooperation (Policy IM1): Show clear agreements with Essex County Council, the NHS, and others to deliver roads, drainage, health, and education infrastructure. 6. Revised wording (Policy SP1): No development on Canvey should go ahead unless safe access, flood protection, and services are proven to be in place and deliverable within the Plan period.						bases unfortunately the council has experienced some delays which has effected the timetable. The council has endeavoured to update the LDS whenever a delay became apparent to maintain transparency. Deliverability All sites included within the plan were submitted by the landowner due to call for sites and/or is owned by the council. Third Road to 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0879-0001	Individual	Douglas	Howard			Yes	SP3	No	The Castle Point Plan Draft is not legally compliant for these reasons: - Lack of community engagement: The consultation fell short of the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement. Residents were not properly informed about proposals affecting health centres, libraries, and emergency services. That level of consultation does not meet legal standards. - Duty to Cooperate: The Draft Plan fails to demonstrate meaningful collaboration with	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The Draft Plan is not sound for these reasons: - Not Positively Prepared: It proposes significant housing growth on Canvey without providing the critical infrastructure needed, particularly a third access road. The Island's transport system is already overstretched. - Not Justified: Proposals target community infrastructure sites such as health centres, fire and police stations, and libraries. These are essential, and the Plan does not justify removing them or show why better alternatives weren't considered. - Not Effective: There is no evidence of landowner commitment or infrastructure funding. Without these, sites are not deliverable. The third road remains unresolved, making the Plan ineffective. - Not Consistent with National Policy: Building in flood-prone areas like Canvey without robust mitigation	The following changes are required: 1. Third access road (Policies IN1, SP1): No further major development should be allowed until a third access road to Canvey is fully funded and delivered. 2. Protect facilities (Policies HO1, SP1): Do not redevelop fire, health, library, or police facilities unless like-for-like replacements are secured. 3. Flood resilience (Policy CC1): All development must be supported by site-specific flood risk and drainage assessments. Infiltration-based SuDS are unsuitable for Canvey. Only pumped or mechanical systems that work with the Island's drainage should be approved. 4. Housing delivery (Policy HO1, Appendix A): Shorten the plan period and reduce housing numbers to realistic levels. Phase delivery so homes are only built once supporting infrastructure is in	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Lack of meaningful engagement Duty to cooperate not met Flood Risk on Canvey LDS changes Deliverability Third road to Canvey Loss of Community Facilities	Lack of meaningful engagement 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. 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. 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 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. LDS Changes In order to be thorough in producing a robust evidence	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
												contradicts the NPPF. Removing vital community services also conflicts with national policy on supporting healthy, resilient communities.	place. 5. Cooperation (Policy IM1): Provide an updated Statement of Common Ground with Essex County Council, the NHS, and others, showing clear commitments for transport, drainage, education, and health. 6. Revised wording (Policy SP1): Development on Canvey must not proceed without confirmed emergency access, flood defences, and infrastructure in place within the Plan period.							bases unfortunately the council has experienced some delays which has effected the timetable. The council has endeavoured to update the LDS whenever a delay became apparent to maintain transparency. Deliverability All sites included within the plan were submitted by the landowner due to call for sites and/or is owned by the council. Third Road to 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 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								Without drainage solutions linked to the pumped network, the Plan does not meet legal compliance. - Local Development Scheme: The timetable has been changed several times, raising concerns about whether the statutory process is being followed correctly. - Deliverability: Some housing sites have no confirmed landowner support or evidence of delivery. Including undeliverable sites undermines the legal requirement to present a										projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. Loss of Community Facilities Policy INFRA1 states that redevelopment of existing community uses will only be supported if: a. The utility and function of the community use is improved; b. The community use is located in the same, or a more sustainable location; c. The site makes the best use of urban land in the Borough	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								realistic Plan.														
0881-0001	Individual	Ann	Mitchell		Yes	SP3	No	Legally compliant or not, Canvey Island's infrastructure is unable to cope with the proposed new builds.	No	Effective	How is Canvey supposed to cope with all the new housing when we are already over populated? Drainage and access on and off the Island is already stretched.		Sound drainage and infrastructure and another road off the Island are vital.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Flood Risk on Canvey Infrastructure Third Road on Canvey	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 management infrastructure		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
																						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. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Third Road on 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		projects identified in the Local Transport Plan.			
0882-0001	Individual	Tracy	Simson		Yes	SP3	No	The Castle Point Plan Draft does not appear to be legally compliant for several reasons: Lack of meaningful community engagement. The plan was not prepared in a manner that aligns with the council's own statement of community involvement. Residents have not been properly consulted on critical aspects such as	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Not positively prepared. The plan proposes significant housing growth across Castle Point, particularly Canvey Island, without delivering the critical infrastructure required to support it. The absence of third access road to Canvey Island undermines the plan's ability to meet the areas need for sustainably or safety. Infrastructure and transport already under significant strain and no realistic solutions included in the draft. Not justified, the strategy appears to prioritise housing numbers over deliverability, safety and sustainability. Brownfield sites	To make the Castle Point Plan Draft legally compliant and sound, the following modifications should be made. 1) infrastructure delivery and access. Policy INI, SP1 Reintroduce and prioritise the creation of a third access road to Canvey as a strategic infrastructure objective within the plan period. Reinstate attendance West access taskforce to ensure proper delivery oversight and consultation with Essex County Council and the Environment Agency. Explicitly state that no further major residential development until this access is secured and	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Lack of meaningful engagement Duty to cooperate not met Flood Risk on Canvey LDS changes Deliverability Third road to Canvey Loss of Community Facilities	Lack of meaningful engagement 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. 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. 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	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 capacity, site delivery and the impact of local services. proposals to redevelop essential community assets, or health centres, police station, fire station and library. Duty to cooperate not demonstrably fulfilled. The plan shows sufficient evidence that Castle Point Borough Council has worked collaboratively with Essex County Council, the Environment Agency and neighbouring authorities, especially shared infrastructure			proposed for redevelopment including vital community infrastructure. Including, health centres, police and fire station and library. the plan lacks a clear explanation as to why these were chosen over more sustainable or deliverable alternatives, such as low density development of infrastructure, first approaches were adequately considered or consulted on. Not justified. The strategy appears to prioritise housing over deliverability, safety and sustainability. Brownfield sites proposed for redevelopment include vital community services. The plan lacks a clear explanation as to why these sites were chosen over more sustainable or deliverable alternatives. Moreover there is no clear evidence that alternative strategies, such as lower-density development of infrastructure -first approaches, were		2) site allocations and community facilities (policies HO1 and SP1) Remove or revise proposals to redevelop key community infrastructure is coffeehouse stations, health centres, library and town centre cardboard listed as brownfield without a clearly identified replacement strategy. Ensure the retention and modernisation of essential community infrastructure is included in the plan as a priority, particularly in underserved or isolated areas such as Canvey Island. 3) flood risk and climate resilience (policy CC1) Require a full site specific flood risk and drainage assessment for all proposed sites on Canvey Island and other flood prone areas before planning permission is granted. Flood risk must be demonstrably reduced and not						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. LDS Changes In order to be thorough in producing a robust evidence base unfortunately the council has experienced some delays which has effected the timetable. The council has endeavoured to update the LDS whenever a delay became apparent to maintain transparency. Deliverability All sites included within the plan were submitted by the landowner due to call for sites and/or is owned by the council. Third Road to 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
							ure, flood risk, mitigation and strategic transport such as a third road. Inadequate consideration of flood risk and environmental constraints . Although the plan is accompanied by a sustainability appraisal, it does not adequately address the environmental consequences of building on Canvey Island, a known flood prone area. Unclear alignment. With local development scheme. The council own timetable and approach outlined in the local					adequately considered or consulted on. Not effective. Many sites included in this plan are not demonstrably deliverable. Rebecca Harris NO Anglican stakeholders have pointed out that there is no clear evidence of landowner commitment, infrastructure funding or timeline to bring sites forward.this undermines The plans effectiveness over the plan period. Not consistent with national policy.The plan does not enable genuinely sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Proposals to build on high flood risk areas, particularly Canvey Island, without adequate mitigation infrastructure or investment in drainage infrastructure directly contradicting NPPF principles. In addition the	just managed, through mitigation measures, including sea defences and sustainable urban drainage systems. 4) housing delivery (policy HO1, appendix A) Reduce the plan period from 20 to 15 years to avoid unnecessary overestimation of housing need and reduce strain on infrastructure. Remove sites from housing trajectory that lack evidence of landowner commitment or deliverable within the plan period. Include a phased approach to housing delivery tied to infrastructure improvements ensuring development is not front loaded before roads, schools and healthcare capacity are increased. 5) Cross-boundary cooperation and evidence base (policy IM1) Provide an updated and transparent statement of common ground showing joint work							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 make a contribution to relevant transport improvement projects identified in the Local Transport Plan. Loss of Community Facilities Policy INFRA1 states that redevelopment of existing community uses will only be supported if: a. The utility and function of the community use is improved; b. The community use is located in the same, or a more sustainable location; c. The site makes the best use of urban land in the Borough		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 scheme have shifted repeatedly, rising concerns about whether the statutory process and timeline have been properly followed.				proposed loss of valued community facilities (library, healthcare and public services) runs counter to national policy on community cohesion, resilience and accessibility.	with Essex County Council, NHS bodies, utility providers and neighbouring authorities. Including clear timelines, funding plans and inconsiderate for all critical infrastructure, transport, education and health reference in the infrastructure delivery plan.									
								Failure to demonstrate deliverability. The sites have been included in the draft without evidence in the draft without evidence of deliverability or landowner commitment.. This may mislead residents and does not meet the requirements to present a plan that can be realistically implement					6) Revised wording (suggested) Current policy SP1 - spatial strategy. "Development on Cancer Island will only be supported where it is demonstrated that adequate emergency access, flood risk mitigation and supplying infrastructure are in place and deliverable within the plan period. Strategic development shall not proceed in areas with a single access route unless a secondary access is secured).									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam			6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								ed within the identified timeframe.																
0884-0001	Individual	Hanna	Stevens		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Justified	The support and infrastructure such as health services, education and childcare provision and other local and social services are insufficient in the borough to meet the needs of this additional number of new properties. The roads are also insufficient to provide safe access to this site. There needs to be significant investment in the local area prior to		Infrastructure changes to be implemented and all of the services above improved and expanded prior to any new build being considered within the Castle Point Borough.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Lack of 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
												considering the expansion of housing. The local main hospital is already struggling to meet the demands of the population coming last as an acute Trust and voted worst large hospital in the country.									
0890 - 0001	Individual	Shelley	Neill		Yes	SP3	No		No	Effective, Justified		Canvey Island does not have the relevant transport links or infrastructure to allow for the plan. Whoever planned this has never sat in the traffic on a daily basis or seen the effect even minor roadworks or an accident can cause on Canvey and all surrounding areas. How is it justified that Canvey would be having the vast majority of new homes built in it. It is already overpopulated with very little in the way of shopping facilities, schools, health facilities.		No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Transport Infrastructure	Transport 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 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	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 matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).		
0894-0001	Individual	Emma	Noakes		Yes	SP3	No	The plan doesn't consider other alternatives like North West Thundersley.	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,	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 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	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
														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 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								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. 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 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,	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.								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 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
0896-0001	Individual	Janet	Chamberlain			Yes	SP3	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	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 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 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	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
										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.								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 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
0899-0001	Individual	Sean	Gough			Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives such as 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	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 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 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	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. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										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 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.								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. 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, 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.							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 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
0907-0001	Individual	david	bass			Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley with no credible five-year housing supply.	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	Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha 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	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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			
											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, 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 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													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 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 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										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 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								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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												Topic Paper - August 2025, which confirms sites GB8A&B are not Potential Grey Belt, with that the complete site or sub-areas are not recommended for further consideration. 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 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								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
														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 benefits of preserving agricultural land applies regardless. Once the graded agricultural land is lost to development, it is lost forever.										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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.																
0914-0001	Individual	Lauren	Whitlock		Yes	SP3	No	I believe other areas of Castle Point (excluding Canvey Island) Has	No	Effective, Justified			No	Not Answered	Not Answered		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
								more scope. But until infrastructure has improved for all of Castle Point, no more houses.													
0915-0001	Individual	Coral	Daly		Yes	SP3	No	Why has North West Thundersley not been included in your Plan	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	The plan is based on the over development of Brownfield sites Why is North West Thundersley NOT included I live close to Hadleigh Castle and opposite the Salvation Army sites Castle Lane is a Lane NOT a road This area should be protected for the wildlife and heritage of this location	North West Thundersley MUST be included in your Plan This location is ideal for the number of housing required to meet local and government targets Infrastructure can be placed for schools - doctors - dentists and the sheer amount of traffic	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West Thundersley No building on HAD2	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. Policy HAD2 does not propose any built development.	N		
0917-0001	Individual	Daniel	Daly		Yes	SP3	No	North West Thundersley has NOT been included in your plan This site is ideal for a majority of housing which will not impact the local community	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	North West Thundersley has NOT been included	There should be NO building works at all on the Salvation Army Land This is an historical site so close to Hadleigh Castle North West Thundersley	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		No building on Salvation Army Land North West Thundersley	HAD2 This policy does not propose any built development 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	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
										in Hadleigh.											
0920-0001	Individual	Juliette	Pearce			Yes	SP3	No	While the Plan has been through consultation, I do not consider it fully legally compliant because:	- It has not demonstrated a clear five-year housing land supply, which is required under the NPPF. - The Duty to Cooperate with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies has not been evidenced by Statements of Common Ground. - The Sustainability	No	Consistent with national policy	The Plan does not meet the tests of soundness because it: - Places disproportionate housing allocations on Canvey Island, despite flood risk, limited access routes, and drainage concerns. Also does not adequately address Hadleigh infrastructure issues from existing overdevelopment. Including road congestion and overstretched drainage systems. - Excludes North West Thundersley (Blinking Owl) without sufficient evidence, even though it offers lower flood risk, better road access, and potential to deliver housing numbers more sustainably. - Fails to provide a justified or deliverable housing strategy over the plan period, leaving other valuable	To make the Plan legally compliant and sound, I suggest: - Including North West Thundersley (Blinking Owl) as a strategic housing growth site. It is already part-brownfield/grey belt, has strong transport links, and could relieve pressure on more sensitive Green Belt, and on Canvey Island. - Reducing the overall allocation for Canvey Island, to reflect its unique flood and drainage risks, and reconsidering any sites where standard SUDS drainage systems would not function. - Strengthening the evidence base on housing supply so that a deliverable five-year supply can be demonstrated, giving real protection to valued Green Belt sites. Including	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Flood risk on Canvey No five year housing land supply No duty to cooperate	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 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. 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	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
												Green Belt land vulnerable to speculative applications. • Does not align with national policy requiring robust evidence of alternatives and a deliverable five-year supply.	Hadleigh farmland/Castle. • Improving cross-boundary cooperation with Essex County Council and neighbouring boroughs, particularly in relation to road infrastructure and drainage.						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 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 housing topic paper. 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.		
0923-0001	Individual	Margaret	Sandcock		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Justified		Whilst, no doubt, the plan is legally compliant, there is much that seems to be unrealistic. The traffic situation	I'm sure you have consulted legal persona, so it is probably legally compliant already!	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	No houses on Canvey until a third road has been built	Third road on Canvey The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending	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
										on Canvey Island, which is referred to in the section noted, is appalling! It is bad elsewhere, but the one key point, Waterside Farm roundabout, bearing the whole of the traffic going off the Island, is unworkable now, and if more houses are built, will cause a longer stand still than is already the case. If each new house has two cars, which many homes do, and people work off the Island, this roundabout will not be navigable. We cannot justify, to current residents, the building of more houses and the council should stand firm against any future development until government provide a second route - I use the term advisedly because there is only one exit - off the Island! The answer is not to sanction any planning for new builds!								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 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.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0926-0001	Individual	Rita	Joiner			Yes	SP3	No	An alternative site - North West Thundersley should have been considered .	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Not consistent with national policy.Ignores Green Belt/Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines.Has not considered all sites and particularly excludes North West Thundersley site.I agree with the Had2 Policy - particularly to protect the farmland as an open space, for nature conservation, ecological restoration and to protect Hadleigh Castle and the heritage site. Any future plans should not impact this very important piece of local history and Green Belt.Any development in that area would need serious consideration in regard to the effect on the increase of traffic and lack of infrastructure, particularly drainage/sewage.	Consideration to be given to the North West Thundersley site.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West ThundersleyGreen/Grey BeltSupports HAD2	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 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, 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	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
																			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.		
0927-0001	Individual	BEVERLEY	GROVES		Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	Does not meet the housing target for castle point. ignores green belt/Grey belt against new NPPF guidelines the draft local plan is not justified. site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no green belt build policy. Site selection is based on the over development of Brownfield sites. Not considered all sites, no greenbelt/Greybelt sites added with the exclusion of North West thundersley. NPPF guidelines state developmennt should be directed away from areas of high risk of flooding. SUDS	Add North West Thundersley stie 187A a Green belt/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	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Doesn't meet housing targets Green/Grey Belt North West Thundersley Flooding on Canvey	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 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	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
										measures are not appropriate for Canvey Islands geography and drainage infrastuture. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey Island is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in East at risk with Emergency evacuation procedures. Canvey is becoming more and more grid locked and an unpleasant place to live. there is no consideration for long term residents and the situation is becoming intolerable as it stands without additional projected number of housing that is proposed to be built. the infrastructure is poorly maintained and is not there for these proposed buildings and addtional residents.								insufficient for the standard methodology requirement for housing set out in the NPPF 2025. 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, 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 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
																				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. Flooding 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 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0929-0001	Individual	Neil	Perry			Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified		I do not believe the current plan is sound and acceptable for the following reasons: 1. The Council has not yet demonstrated a deliverable five-year housing land supply in its current format which is a fundamental test of the the plans credibility. 2. In order to do this it has to pass 4 tests of soundness which are that it is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with the National policy - I believe the current plan does not meet these essential criteria fully. I appreciate they have endeavoured to protect the Green belt sites which are a much loved and beautiful feature of the area but in doing that I do not believe they have considered an option which is worth considering. 3. The overall housing target for Castle Point that has been imposed centrally is simply impossible to meet without permanently damaging the character and beauty of the area	Please refer to my previous answer above In summary the current plan requires revision to meet the soundness tests, the number of homes on Canvey should be reconsidered, the shortfall addressed by improving the brownfield strategy and including North West Thundersley to improve the plan significantly and thereby reducing the gap to housing target in the process. Essex Council would be legally obliged to co-operate through its infrastructure investment to take advantage of North West Thundersley as a key strategic opportunity for sustainable growth.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	No five year housing land supply Exclusion of North West Thundersley Canvey Flooding Third road onto canvey	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 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 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.		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
										plan. 5. The sustainability appraisal within the plan does not assess North West Thundersley site in sufficient depth or with the rigour that has been applied to the other locations - this in itself renders the current plan unsound and in turn the five year housing land supply is not sufficiently demonstrated with the reliance on constrained sites casting serious doubt on deliverability of the plan 6. The NPPF is clear through paragraphs 159 and 161 that any development should be away from areas at the highest risk for flooding - this has most impact on the Canvey Island proposal in the plan which although it has current effective mitigation in this regard any future adjustments required to the sustainable urban drainage systems are of a unique nature so as not to upset the balance of the existing drainage network									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 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 any on sire drainage systems unable to mechanically discharge or be connected into a properly managed system pose an unacceptable risk - Canvey has a unique geography and the plan does not reflect this in reality or show how the risk of new flooding or contamination of the groundwater would be mitigated. 7. The current plan places too much housing demand on Canvey Island despite its history, unique geography and serious infrastructure limits so building 3,300 homes there is excessive and not justified in the current plan. Canvey also only two access points which is a serious which is strategically a serious weakness 8. The exclusion of North West Thundersley is difficult to understand - it has far better transport connectivity, much lower flood risk and is supported strongly in the local areas - this site is mainly plotlands															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 industrial units and any development there would impact far fewer residents - excluding it is not justified well enough in the current plan and the Sustainability Appraisal fails to assess it as a reasonable, viable alternative. 9. In my opinion I believe that the housing number for Canvey should be reduced and also be contingent upon clear robust measures against flooding, including a unique and comprehensive drainage plan together with exploring the need for a third access route to alleviate the gridlock situation that currently exists on and off the island - North West Thundersley offer a better alternative with better connections, a lesser flood risk and the potential for a much better infrastructure. The site (including the area known as the Blinking Owl) has previously been recognised in earlier studies as being capable of providing space for											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											up to and in excess of 5,000 homes. The combination of the two measures (Canvey Reduction and use of North Thundersley) would provide for a greater number of houses and reduce the short fall of the current plan to a more acceptable level and much closer to the Government Assessed need. 10. Claims that the North Thundersley site is not viable due to policy restrictions by the local Highways Authority are not justified in the plan and do not pass scrutiny - the current investment in the Fairglen Interchange of £59 million includes new slip roads, signal junctions and pedestrian and cycling infrastructure are designed to help accommodate future housing and economic growth for South Essex. There is an acknowledgement in Essex Councils infrastructure planning documents that the A127/A130 transport corridor will come under further pressure													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 that long term options to expand it remain viable. 11. Although part of the North Thundersley site are designated as Green Belt; including it can be justified under paragraph 143 of the NPPF which says that Green Belt release is allowed where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated clearly - in this case Castle Point has a severe housing shortfall, and North West Thundersley offers an area where growth can be delivered in a safe way, sustainably and with less environmental impact and will affect fewer residents as it is mainly "grey belt" inaccessible land, industrial units and plotlands. This fits the terms of strategic release of green belt by protecting more sensitive areas and placing growth where it can supported properly 12. To conclude the current plan requires revision to meet the soundness tests, the number 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
													homes on Canvey should be reconsidered, the shortfall addressed by improving the brownfield strategy and including North West Thundersley to improve the plan significantly and thereby reducing the gap to housing target in the process. Essex Council would be legally obliged to co-operate through its infrastructure investment to take advantage of North West Thundersley as a key strategic opportunity for sustainable growth.										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0930-0001	Individual	Cheryl	Perry			Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy		My concerns regarding the soundness of the plan I wish to record my concerns regarding the soundness to the current version of the Castle Point Local Plan. While I acknowledge the Council's efforts in formulating a development strategy that preserves the green belt land, I do not believe the draft plan is sound. There are several critical weaknesses, particularly in terms of housing delivery, site selection, infrastructure capacity, and the inclusion of viable alternatives. I've summarised my concerns below: 1. Lack of a Demonstrable Five-Year Housing Land Supply A key requirement of national planning policy is that local authorities must demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing land supply. The current plan has a number of omissions and	See my comments above	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	No five year housing land supply Exclusion of North West Thundersley Infrastructure Not meeting housing targets without justification	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 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 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	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		
											falls far short of the Governments housing target requirement achieving only 53% of the requirement. Whilst I believe the Government target is not wholly achievable the plan needs to demonstrate that all alternatives have been properly considered and there are omissions in the current plan. 2. Insufficient Consideration of Alternatives Undermines the Plan's Soundness The Local Plan must satisfy four key tests: it must be positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy. Although the Council has sought to protect the Green Belt—a valued asset in the borough—it has failed to properly consider other reasonable and sustainable alternatives. The exclusion of North West Thundersley, despite its development potential and relatively low environmental sensitivity,												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. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 deliver this scale of growth 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. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required				
										undermines the plan's justification and raises questions about whether the strategy has been robustly tested. 3. Overambitious Targets with Negative Local Impact The centrally imposed housing requirement for Castle Point is extremely difficult to meet without placing an unacceptable burden on local infrastructure and causing long-term harm to the character of the borough. The plan proposes growth in areas that are already stretched in terms of services, traffic capacity, and environmental resilience. Without more balanced site selection, the plan risks doing more harm than good. 4. Inadequate Justification for Housing Shortfall The current draft only aims to deliver around 50% of the total housing need—leaving a shortfall a significant shortfall. While constraints such as													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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
														flood risk and infrastructure limitations are acknowledged, the plan does not provide sufficient evidence that every reasonable alternative has been explored to reduce the gap. The exclusion of North West Thundersley is particularly concerning in this context, as its inclusion could significantly reduce the shortfall in a sustainable way. 5. Lack of Rigorous Assessment for North West Thundersley The Sustainability Appraisal fails to assess North West Thundersley with the same level of detail and objectivity applied to other sites. This inconsistency calls into question the transparency of the site selection process. Given the potential of the area to support development with lower environmental and infrastructure risks, its dismissal is not adequately justified and compromises the robustness of the overall 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									
														6. Flood Risk Not Properly Addressed for Canvey Island National planning policy clearly advises against placing development in areas of high flood risk unless absolutely necessary and without proper mitigation. Canvey Island is uniquely vulnerable due to its geography and reliance on complex drainage systems. While the plan references existing mitigation, it does not demonstrate how future drainage needs would be managed or how risks to groundwater and flood safety would be contained as development expands with the proposed 3,300 houses. 7. Excessive Development Burden on Canvey Island Allocating 3,300 new homes to Canvey Island is disproportionate, given its limited road access, historical flood issues, and already overburdened infrastructure. The island has only two																			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name		Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														access points, creating a major vulnerability during peak traffic or emergencies. The scale of development proposed for Canvey is not matched by any convincing infrastructure upgrades in the plan and appears unjustified in the broader context of available alternatives. 8. Unjustified Exclusion of North West Thundersley North West Thundersley has strong potential to accommodate housing growth: it has better transport links, minimal flood risk, and is supported locally. The area includes a significant amount of low-value land such as industrial sites, plotlands and inaccessible land. Its exclusion from the plan lacks a sound explanation and ignores a viable, lower-impact alternative that could help meet housing needs more sustainably, significantly reduce the gap to target and with less											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														disruption to existing communities. 9. Balanced Strategy Required: Reduce Canvey Allocation and include the North West Thundersley site. A more effective and balanced strategy would be to scale back the housing numbers allocated to Canvey Island, making any development there contingent on clear, enforceable flood mitigation plans and improved access. In parallel, North West Thundersley should be brought forward for housing allocation and added to the proposal, although classified as some green belt it meets the requirements for a justified green belt exception unlike other green belt sites in the locality. Previous studies have identified this area (also known as the Blinking Owl site) as being capable of delivering in excess of 5,000 homes. This would help address the housing shortfall while placing											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name		Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 where infrastructure and environmental risks are more manageable. 10. Transport Constraints Argument Not Substantiated Claims that North West Thundersley cannot be brought forward due to local highways policies do not withstand scrutiny. The planned £59 million upgrade of the Fairglen Interchange will introduce new capacity through additional slip roads, signal junctions, and pedestrian/cycle links. Essex County Council's own infrastructure documents acknowledge that the A127/A130 corridor will likely need to be expanded to support future growth. The assertion that the area is not viable due to Highways Authority restrictions is therefore incorrect and not a viable reason to exclude the North West Thundersley site. 11. 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				
										Release Justified by Exceptional Circumstances While part of North West Thundersley lies within the Green Belt, national policy (paragraph 143 of the NPPF) allows for Green Belt release in cases of exceptional need. Castle Point’s acute housing shortfall and lack of available unconstrained land qualify as such circumstances. Much of the land in question is of low environmental value—largely made up of plotlands, inaccessible land and industrial uses (grey belt) —and its development would be far less intrusive than building in the other green belt areas. 12. Conclusion and Recommended Changes In its current form, the Local Plan does not meet the tests of soundness and should be revised. Key changes required include: A reduction in the scale of development															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
												proposed for Canvey Island, contingent upon stronger flood protections and access improvements. The inclusion of North West Thundersley as a strategic housing site. A more transparent and evidence-based justification for site selection and housing distribution. A strategy that brings the plan closer to meeting the full housing requirement while aligning with sustainable development principles. Castle Point has a responsibility to deliver new homes, but this must be done in a way that protects residents, infrastructure, and the environment. A more balanced, evidence-led approach would significantly improve the soundness and deliverability of the plan.											
0933 -	Individual	Jennie	Cavill		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Effective, Justified		I am concerned that with the traffic and parking already under strain, we	Consideration into the above points.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Infrastructure	Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and 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
0001												can not support this amount of new housing. We also have a child care issue in the local area, where will any new children be going to school ? Have the local nursery's/schools been geared up to help support parents ? Please speak to local nurseries who have closed waiting lists ?							supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).		
0934-0001	Individual	John	Stone		Yes	SP3	No	Excluding and/or failing to adequately consider strategic alternatives across the Borough, including the obvious site North West Thundersley commonly known as the Blinking Owl site. Due to a lack of consideration of perfectly reasonable green belt / grey belt sites the proposed plan appears to	No	Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The draft local plan is not consistent with National Policy. It does not meet the housing target for Castle Point. The Council has not provided adequate and strong enough evidence for not meeting the Government's housing targets. Development should be directed away from areas of highest risk of flooding. Canvey Island has the highest flood risk category in the Borough and yet has been allocated the highest number of dwellings of all the Borough areas. There is a risk of tidal flooding in the future due to environmental challenges. The surface water	The North West Thundersley site should be included in the plan. The site is approximately 187 hectares of Grey Belt, Brown Belt, Green Belt land possibly accommodating 7500 dwellings. Adoption of this site would least significantly affect the residents of Castle Point and is far more suitable for development than Canvey West. Reducing the urban housing target for the Borough from 6200 dwellings to 3500 dwellings including reducing Canvey Island's allocation to 1050 dwellings. Include the provision that none of the final housing allocation	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt No five year housing land supply Consultation process difficult Not meeting the housing target Flood Risk on Canvey Transport COMAH Emergency evacuation	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. Green/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	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
								be predetermined due to a no building on green belt policy. There is no credible five year housing land supply. Due process has not been fulfilled in that the Regulation 18 and this regulation 19 Consultation has been overly complicated and onerous for the average person to complete and hence the individuals right to engagement in the process with many residents giving up on their right to make a proper response. The right to make an informed				drainage often only just copes and at times, and additional dwelling on this scale will make the problems worse leading to more surface water flooding incidents. The foul water system is pumped, often through small bore pipework, and barely copes at times with the present dwelling numbers on the Island. Due to Canvey Island's unique geography there is a need for open undeveloped land to act as drainage and flood planes. The Strategic Drainage Design measures applied are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. The road system on Canvey Island cannot cope at peak times or if there is a road traffic incident on or around the Island, the Island is often gridlocked. The road network needs much improvement as things stand and would not cope with an additional 3000 plus dwellings. It can take 45 minutes to	on Canvey Island be built until the road infrastructure is totally overhauled and improved. Include the provision that no dwellings be built within the blast radius of the two Top Tier COMAH sites.							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 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. 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								response has been denied due to the poor set up at the open meetings. There is no clear evidence of the fulfillment of the Council's 'Duty to Co-Operate.				get from the Town Center to the Canvey West area (under two miles in distance) and adding 2000 homes in Canvey West would make the journey unbearable both at the West end of the Island and further down the Island due to the backing up effect and due to the additional dwellings to the South and the Town Center. The proposed Canvey West site is very close to the two Top Tier COMAH sites situated on the Island. When considering what happened in Buncefield this exposes residents in any new development in Canvey West to unnecessary risk. Emergency escape for the whole Island would be impossible. The site selection strategy appears to be biased and predetermined towards a 'no green belt inclusion' policy. The Council have not considered adequately other Grey Belt/ Green Belt sites and excludes the North							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 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.	Consultation Process concerns 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.	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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required				
												West Thundersley (Blinking Owl) option which therefore directs development towards unsuitable and higher risk areas such as Canvey West. The Canvey West proposal puts other residents on the Island at higher risk in the event of an emergency evacuation requirement. The 3000 plus dwellings proposed for Canvey Island including the 2000 for Canvey West is not resident led. The suggested density of homes in Canvey West is far too high and needs to be reduced. The density would suggest that buildings would need to be built higher which would completely alter the nature of the area and Island. Canvey Island is classified as having the highest level of deprivation in Castle Point and the proposed plan will not improve the situation in any way likely making the situation worse. The 3000 plus dwellings for Canvey Island and the 2000 dwellings proposed for												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 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. 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 management infrastructure	

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
										Canvey West should be reconsidered. It does unfortunately appear that the Council have decided to dump the Borough's housing numbers on Canvey Island. The Castle Point Plan, as it stands, will be detrimental to the Health and Wellbeing of the Island residents.								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. 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 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. COMAH 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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 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 ‘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’.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
																					Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0939-0001	Individual	Greer	Stone			Yes	SP3	No	The Consultation is overly complicated and onerous for the average person to complete. The Consultation events were not run as a proper consultation and were more of a display saying this is what we are going to do. The above the residents right to engagement and right to response has been denied. There is no clear evidence of the Council's duty to co-operate with other authorities such as Essex County Council or Anglian Water. I have been told that	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The Plan is not resident led for Canvey Island. Development should be directed away from areas of highest flood risk. Canvey Island is the highest flood risk category in the Borough. There has been no proper consultation with the sewage authority for Canvey Island. The foul water system barely copes at present and would be overwhelmed if 3000 plus additional homes were added. The proposed Canvey West Site and Charfleets site are dangerously close to the two Top Tier COMAH sites exposing potential residents to unnecessary risk. The Canvey Island proposals are not resident led. The Canvey Island West proposal puts the Island at risk in the event of an emergency evacuation. The road network is gridlocked as	The urban housing target for the Borough should be reduced especially for Canvey Island with consideration being given to building on greybelt or small areas of suitable greenbelt instead. Include provisions that none of the final housing allocation on Canvey Island be built before the road and drainage infrastructure is totally overhauled and improved. Include a provision that no additional homes be built near the two Top Tier COMAH sites. Adjust the proposed plan directing new building away from the highest flood risk areas of the Borough. Include the North West Thundersley site (Blinking Owl) in the plan. This site would create its own small village with all of the necessary infrastructure and would lead to the least disruption to the Borough overall.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Consultation too complicated Duty to Cooperate Other strategic sites not considered Flood Risk on Canvey COMAH Transport Greenbelt/Greybelt	Consultation 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. 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. Other strategic sites not considered All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 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 management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4, SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the plan, and 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
								there has not been a proper discussion with Anglian Water (Canvey Island's sewage authority) regarding the excessive number of dwellings being added to the already overloaded sewage system. The Council has not adequately considered strategic alternative sites across the Borough. The Council have proposed that nearly half of the Borough's assessed housing needs be placed in the highest flood risk area in the Borough. The Council have not taken			things stand and cannot cope with the additional homes being proposed. The routes on and off the Island is gridlocked for much of the day and at weekends and so many additional homes would impair on the quality of life for Island residents.								evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. COMAH 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 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 is proposed.' The current HSE consultation zones are indicated on the policies map. The 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
																				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, 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 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
0951-0001	Individual	Margaret	England			Yes	SP3	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	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
													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.								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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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
0952-0001	Individual	John	England			Yes	SP3	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	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
													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.									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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0954-0001	Individual	Val	Hammond			Yes	SP3	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, 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 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led, the Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures, and 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.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West thundersley No five year housing land supply Not meeting housing target Green/Grey Belt Flood risk on canvey Infrastructure Support for Policy C7	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once 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
												higher rainfall Canvey 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.							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 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 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 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. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Support for policy C7 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
0959-0001	Individual	Sophie	England			Yes	SP3	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	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
												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.									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 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 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				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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		
0959-0002	Individual	Sophie	England		Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Effective, 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	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		A	Overdevelopment of brownfield sites North West Thundersley	Density The density for sites allocated within the plan has been informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details. 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	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 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 the over															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
												development of our urban sites.									
0961-0001	Individual	Dina	Mehdi		Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy		The Plan falls short in demonstrating a deliverable five-year housing land supply. Strengthening the brownfield strategy and including North West Thundersley would improve resilience and deliverability. Essex County Council is investing in infrastructure and would be legally obliged to cooperate. North West Thundersley offers a strategic opportunity for sustainable growth.	Add North West Thundersley site 187 hectares as a Green belt/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 11000.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Supports HAD2	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 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	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
																					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, 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 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 please		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0962-0001	Individual	Kevin	Ford			Yes	SP3	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 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 area's at highest risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts the residents in the East at risk with	Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha, 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.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West thundersley No five year housing land supply Not meeting housing target Green/Grey Belt Flood risk on canvey Infrastructure	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
												emergency evacuation procedures.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	</

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 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. 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
0963-0001	Individual	Clive	Ellis			Yes	SP3	No	The council have failed to give fair consideration to strategic opportunities of the use of grey belt sites on the mainland in Benfleet / Thundersley under the NPPF Guide lines totally ignored the required numbers issued by the housing minister.	No	Positively prepared, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The NPPF clearly states that grey belt should be considered as part of the plan development to achieve the number of houses required, no true consideration of respecting these numbers requested have been considered as only just over half have been achieved The draft local plan is not consistent with national policy. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point. . The draft local plan is not justified. Site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no greenbelt political stand point". 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	We should aim for at least 70% of the required housing numbers as set out. a 3rd road scheme must be put in place for the Canvey's further development to absorb the additional 20 - 30% in the final years of this plan this gives time to act on the roads and infrastructure of Canvey enabling it to cope in the later part of the plan .	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West thundersley No five year housing land supply Not meeting housing target Green/Grey Belt Flood risk on canvey Infrastructure Third road onto Canvey	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once 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
										and drainage infrastructure. The 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedure no further development of Canvey Island should take place until a 3rd access is completed.								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 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 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			

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
																						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 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 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			

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
																				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 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 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		

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
																				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 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
0966-0002	Individual	Matt Hew	England		Yes	SP3	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		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 meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Flood risk on Canvey Overdevelopment of brownfield sites	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
										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.										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 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 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
																						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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 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. Density The density for sites allocated within the plan has been 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
0967-0002	Individual	Kelly	Bullis			Yes	SP3	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	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		A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Flood risk on Canvey Overdevelopment of brownfield sites	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once 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
												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.							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 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 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
																						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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 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. Density The density for sites allocated within the plan has been informed by the Density and Capacity Study July 2025, please see this for further details.		
0969 - 0001	Individual	Alan	Tibbit		Yes	SP3	No	The whole plan is predetermined. Councillors before election stated in their manifesto documents that No Green Belt would be	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The refusal to use Green belt under any circumstances to appease the few who elected the Councillors goes against all legal requirements, is predetermined by the majority Party PIP and supported by CIIP. On this predetermination alone all of the	1. The removal of use of land designated as future industrial expansion land as on Canvey West C4 2. The addition of the North West Thundersley site 3. The addition of land at Kings Park HO31, which has been removed	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Flood risk on canvey Evacuation Infrastructure North west thundersley Addition of HO31 - Kings Park Removal of Policy C4	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	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
							built on. That is predisposition and is allowed. However to then dismiss ALL Green Belt from the process of fairness and equity in discussion/debate, is not allowed and is predetermination. The Councillors have followed the predisposition they used to get elected and have unfairly, especially with regard to basically dumping 3000+ homes on Canvey West industrial use sites, ignored all flood plain warnings, danger regarding evacuation of residents, for any				requirements of producing a fair and equitable Local Plan have been broken.	from previously prepared Plans due to proven Councillor preference, even though it has been surveyed in November 2021 and found to be sound for development, with the additional Site Owner agreeing to build under a s106 agreement , a Doctors Surgery as part of the development.						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. Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/ Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). North West			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							n, but unearthed by diligent research. It shows clearly this is not in fact true, as ECC state categorically they will work with any developer on any site to improve/create access by joint negotiations with any developer. To do that however the Land in question has to be submitted as useful development land and plans submitted. The Council and Councillors were aware of this but chose to ignore this site which is a mixture of Green/Grey Belt and industrial use land, which has														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Modifications Required
								none of the problems that the Canvey West proposals have.															
0975-0003	Agent	Daniel	Rapson	Privo Land Limited c/o Ceres Property	Yes	SP3	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	4.1 Policy SP3 is fundamentally unsound. It is unjustified, fails to ensure the DLP is positively prepared, clearly contrary to national policy, and substantial concerns with its effectiveness. The reasons for this are set out below.Amount4.2 Policy SP3 of the Draft Local Plan (DLP) proposes the delivery of 6,196 homes between 2026 and 2043, equating to an average of 364 dwellings per annum (dpa). This is despite the DLP acknowledging at paragraph 6.52 that the housing requirement for this period is 11,662 dwellings—based on the standard method for calculating local housing need as set out in the			Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes	A	Housing Supply Suggests conflicts with NPPF and PPGGreen Belt/Grey BeltThe substantial shortfall in housing provision proposed by the DLP is evidently a consequence of its refusal to amend the Borough's Green Belt boundaries. The DLP adopts an overly rigid, almost sacrosanct approach to the Green Belt, which is fundamentally at odds with national planning policy. In contrast, the NPPF makes clear that Green Belt boundaries can be altered through the Local Plan process where justified by exceptional circumstances, such as meeting	Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard methodThrough robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing deliveryCastle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.Within the NPPF Paragraph 11 section b (a) and (ii) give an acknowledgement of circumstances in which national policy does not expect Standard Method outcomes to be met in full. Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply and TimescalesHousing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land	See Schedule of Modifications re: flooding			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Notably, the DLP appears to overlook that this figure represents a minimum requirement under national policy.4.3 Even if the DLP were to deliver all the homes it claims it will (a proposition that is subject to significant doubt, as discussed later in this representation), this would still result in a shortfall of 5,466 dwellings. In effect, the DLP seeks to deliver just 53% of the minimum housing requirement set out in the NPPF. There is no evidence of robust arrangements to ensure that the Borough’s residual housing need will be met elsewhere within the wider housing market area.4.4 This approach is clearly inconsistent with the NPPF. More importantly, it contradicts a core aspect of national policy that the Government has identified as critical for Local Planning Authorities to					identified housing needs.Highlights changes to NPPF Green/Grey Belt classification.. <timescales 10="" 150="" a="" acute="" addition="" address="" also="" an="" and="" approach="" are="" as="" be="" borough,="" but="" compared="" concerns="" delivery="" density="" development="" development.="" dlp="" dph="" even="" evidence="" existing="" extremely="" fail="" feasible="" first="" flattened="" for="" high="" housing="" if="" in="" is="" issues="" it="" lack="" local="" mean="" nature<="" necessitate="" needs="" not="" nppf,="" of="" one="" only="" out="" overall="" particularly="" per="" period.densitiesthe="" plan="" policy="" proposed="" proposed,="" quantum="" regarding="" require="" set="" shortage="" significant="" sp3.="" strategy="" substantiate="" suggests="" td="" that="" the="" there="" this="" timing="" to="" will="" with="" within="" years="" –=""><td></td><td></td><td>supply.Green Belt/Grey Belt Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.DensitiesPolicy Hou3 indicates the housing mix, including in Premium sustainability areas.Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).Emergency PlanningPolicy 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.Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</td><td></td></timescales>			supply.Green Belt/Grey Belt Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.DensitiesPolicy Hou3 indicates the housing mix, including in Premium sustainability areas.Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).Emergency PlanningPolicy 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.Needs of emergency services considered in 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
														address in tackling the national housing crisis.4.5 Even setting aside the DLP's direct conflict with the NPPF and PPG, the social and economic consequences of failing to meet housing needs are severe, as outlined in Section 3 of this representation. However, these impacts do not appear to have been given appropriate weight in determining the number of homes to be delivered.4.6 Section 3 of this representation also sets out concerns regarding Policy SP3 in the context of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the SEA Regulations. These concerns directly affect the soundness of the DLP, particularly in relation to the requirement for Local Plans to be justified. The SA fails to provide a credible rationale for the DLP's decision not to meet housing needs in full, relying instead on flawed reasoning that does not properly assess the							could be delivered whilst also providing for a variety of house types as needed and / or meeting the development management standards the DLP proposes.Flood RiskThe NPPF is clear that development should be directed away from areas at higher risk of flooding. Given that there are alternative sites within the Borough subject to lower flood risk—which have been rejected—the DLP's approach in this regard is not justified. The DLP does not appear to be supported by a sequential test that could justify such an approach as the NPPF requires. Even if it could be shown to pass the sequential test, there is a lack of evidence to confirm development would be capable of passing the exceptions test for development in areas of flood risk. To rely so heavily on 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		
										implications of meeting versus failing to meet those needs.4.7 The substantial shortfall in housing provision proposed by the DLP is evidently a consequence of its refusal to amend the Borough's Green Belt boundaries. The DLP adopts an overly rigid, almost sacrosanct approach to the Green Belt, which is fundamentally at odds with national planning policy. In contrast, the NPPF makes clear that Green Belt boundaries can be altered through the Local Plan process where justified by exceptional circumstances, such as meeting identified housing needs.4.8 It is worth noting that the Council previously prepared a Local Plan under the 2021 NPPF, which included limited Green Belt release and aimed to deliver 5,510 homes between 2018 and 2032—an average of 367 dpa. That plan was examined and found sound, subject to main										delivery of such a development site, fundamental to the DLP's proposed housing strategy, is unjustified and alarming.HSE Hazardous Installations Consultation ZoneThe proposals appear to focus significant scale development in the HSE Hazardous Installations Consultation Zone. There are two Upper Tier COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazard) sites located on Canvey Island. It is unclear if the HSE would consider West Canvey an appropriate location to which to direct significant scale housing growth.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required							
												modifications, but was ultimately withdrawn by the Council. The withdrawn but sound Local Plan ('wLP') took a pragmatic approach to Green Belt alterations to meet housing needs, and was found to be consistent with national policy at the time—despite that policy being less permissive than the current NPPF, which the present DLP must adhere to.4.9 In terms of changes to the NPPF and PPG since the wLP, three key aspects merit highlighting:Exceptional Circumstances and National PolicyThe NPPF now explicitly confirms that exceptional circumstances justifying alterations to Green Belt boundaries through the Local Plan process include, but are not limited to, situations where a Local Planning Authority is unable to meet its housing needs through other means.Grey Belt ClassificationThe introduction of 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
										'grey belt' concept—referring to Green Belt land that does not strongly serve purposes (a), (b), or (d) of Green Belt designation—provides a clear basis for prioritising such land for release. These areas should be considered as part of any Green Belt review and released ahead of more sensitive greenfield Green Belt sites.Increased Housing RequirementThe minimum housing requirement for which the Borough needs to plan has increased substantially, strengthening the case that alterations to the Green Belt are necessary.4.10 The Council's Castle Point Green Belt Assessment (July 2025) identifies a number of potential grey belt sites within the Borough. The key point in relation to the soundness of Policy SP3 is that there are evidently Green Belt sites that do not strongly contribute to purposes (a), (b) or (d) of the Green											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 and could be utilised to reduce the need for housing. Even if development of such land would not meet needs in full, it could reduce the shortfall significantly compared to current proposals.4.11 The Council’s Housing Capacity Topic Paper 2025 makes reference to Borough’s Green Belt being “heavily constrained...[but] even with potentially unconstrained areas, sustainable accessibility and infrastructure deliverability present significant barrier to development” (page 66). However, the DLP lacks any robust evidence to demonstrate that there are no Green Belt sites subject to such constraints that they cannot sustainably provide homes for the Borough.4.12 For example, in seeking to justify the DLP’s approach, and in respect of transport and sustainable access, the Council’s Housing Capacity Topic										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
												Paper 2025 asserts at paragraph 12.9 that sites on the edge of settlements do not have access to services or public transport provision and that Green Belt sites promoted would not be developed at a density that would enable public transport services to be sustained. At 12.12 it goes on to conclude:“It is therefore appropriate and in accordance with the NPPF to avoid development in the Green Belt as it would not be sustainably located and would impact on traffic capacity on the local and strategic highway network. This is consistent with paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF.”4.13 This conclusion is baseless and does not use common sense or logic and seems to suggest edge of settlement sites are rural, divorced from the settlement they are on the edge of, and therefore remote and isolated from services. Even if you were to disregard this assumption, or 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					
														sustainable transport is not limited to public transport, the conclusion fails to consider potential mitigation measures that might be required. In any case, the Council's own evidence does not support this position adopted by the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, the Green Belt Site Assessment (July 2025) suggests there are Green Belt sites that have been promoted that are capable of being considered suitable from a transport and accessibility perspective in that they are capable of complying with NPPF paragraphs 110 and 115.4.14 Despite the Council expressing their concerns in terms of their ability to address the minimum housing requirement and prepare a plan that can be found sound, directly to the Secretary of State for MHCLG in April 2025, the response from the Secretary of State (30 June 2025) made clear that 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		
										Council is expected to quickly bring forward a Local Plan that can be found sound. Given this very clear response from the MHCLG, it is unclear why the Council has proceeded to consult on a DLP in its current form.Timescales for Delivery4.15 In addition to concerns regarding the overall quantum of housing proposed, there are also significant issues with the timing of delivery set out in Policy SP3. Not only will the DLP fail to address local housing needs as per the NPPF, but the strategy will mean the shortage will be particularly acute in the first 10 years of the plan period.4.16 Policy SP3 suggests that in the first five years of the plan period (2026-2031), the DLP will seek to provide for an average of 209 dpa (just 30% of its local housing need); rising to 253 dpa for the period 2031-2036 (37% of its local housing need); and then increasing significantly,													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required			
												although the figures are still substantially short of the 686 dpa minimum, to 554 dpa from 2031-2043.4.17 The sequenced approach to delivery of housing growth set out in Policy SP3 is problematic for the following three reasons.4.18 Firstly, there is an urgent need to redress the woeful supply of housing, nationally, immediately. Pushing the delivery of homes to a later date does not address the current chronic shortage, only exacerbating the shortfall, amplifying the socio-economic ripple effects of the crisis.4.19 Secondly, the PPG is clear that if a housing trajectory is to be stepped, there should be clear justification for doing so. The strategy must also ensure housing needs are met in full in the plan period. In the DLP's case, neither criterion has been met.4.20 Thirdly, the LHNA identifies that whilst the affordable housing												

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
												need for the Borough over the plan period totals 3,976 dwellings, there are an is estimated 3,220 households in the Borough currently living in unsuitable housing and are unable to afford their own housing, i.e. the vast majority of the community's affordable housing needs are an immediate need. The DLP failure to plan positively to deliver homes, including affordable housing, in the early part of the plan period in particular will have significant negative social repercussions for the Borough.Deliverability4.21 Policy SP3 places significant reliance on redevelopment of urban sites on Canvey Island in order to achieve its proposed housing figure of 6,196 homes.4.22 A total of 3,143 new homes—representing 51% of the Borough's overall housing provision—are proposed to be delivered through this approach. Of these, 2,000											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										homes are allocated to the redevelopment of land at West Canvey (Policy C4). However, it is unclear whether this site is suitable, available, or achievable for residential development. As the DLP itself acknowledges, the land is currently occupied by employment uses and a retail park, with a diverse mix of active businesses.4.23 The DLP suggests the proposed approach will require a density of 150 dph – an extremely high density compared to existing development within the Borough, and one that will necessitate flattened development. There is a lack of evidence to substantiate if it is even feasible for a development of this nature could be delivered whilst also providing for a variety of house types as needed and / or meeting the development management standards the DLP proposes.4.24 Furthermore, the location is 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		
										Flood Zone 3 – land at greatest risk of flooding from tidal or fluvial sources. The NPPF is clear that development should be directed away from areas at higher risk of flooding. Given that there are alternative sites within the Borough subject to lower flood risk—which have been rejected—the DLP’s approach in this regard is not justified. The DLP does not appear to be supported by a sequential test that could justify such an approach as the NPPF requires. Even if it could be shown to pass the sequential test, there is a lack of evidence to confirm development would be capable of passing the exceptions test for development in areas of flood risk. To rely so heavily on the delivery of such a development site, fundamental to the DLP’s proposed housing strategy, is unjustified and alarming.4.25 Furthermore, this area has some of the weakest connectivity 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	
											access to sustainable forms of transport relative to other parts of the Borough. It is particularly detached from the Borough's railway station.4.26 Finally, the proposals appear to focus significant scale development in the HSE Hazardous Installations Consultation Zone. There are two Upper Tier COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazard) sites located on Canvey Island. It is unclear if the HSE would consider West Canvey an appropriate location to which to direct significant scale housing growth.													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0975-0004	Agent	Daniel	Rapson	Privo Land Limited c/o Ceres Property	Yes	SP3	No		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	5.1 This section of our representation concerns the DLP's site selection process insofar as it concerns site GB12 / (Site ID40498) / Land at and to the rear of 82 The Chase, Thundersley ('the Site'). 5.2 The DLP does not allocate any Green Belt land for residential development. The evidence provided by the Council to justify this position is highly questionable, particularly given that the withdrawn Local Plan (wLP) was only recently examined and found sound on the basis that allocating multiple sites within the Green Belt was an appropriate and justified approach. 5.3 Consequently, the Borough's minimum housing requirement is significantly greater; and the NPPF and PPG are clear on both the need to amend Green Belt boundaries where housing needs cannot otherwise be met, and on the need to take a more permissive approach to	5.33 It is grey belt land that should be prioritised for allocation through the new Local Plan.	Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes	A	Makes case for the inclusion of Site GB12 Land at and to the rear of 82 The Chase, Thundersley.		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							
												considering the suitability of Green Belt land to be allocated for development. 5.4 In this context, the Council's position as set out in the DLP cannot be justified. Sustainability / Suitability 5.5 The Site adjoins the existing residential envelope of a settlement identified as sustainable to accommodate proportionate growth in the current Development Plan. It adjoins existing residential areas, to the north, south, partly east and west. Importantly, the site is situated within the Thundersley North and Thundersley South wards, very much within Thundersley. 5.6 The Site is not subject to any physical, environmental, or heritage constraints that suggest it would be unsuitable for residential development. The site does sit within a wider Local Wildlife Site (LoWS), which is not a statutory																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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, but mitigation can address any adverse effects. Therefore, the Site's only constraint to development is that it is located on land designated as Green Belt in the Development Plan dating back to 1998. This designation acts as a policy constraint—a limitation shared by the majority of land that could otherwise help meet the Borough's needs. 5.7 On 2 October 2020 the wLP was submitted for examination. The Inspector concluded that with modifications the new Castle Point Local Plan was legally compliant and sound and capable of adoption. 5.8 The Inspector's report sets out main modifications (MM) required, in order to enable the Plan can be adopted. To revise the local housing need figure to reflect changed input figures; To set a stepped housing requirement to reflect the likely																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 homes in the plan period, and the significant uplift in housing land supply proposed which will take some time to deliver; To amend the Green Belt Policies so that unnecessary duplication is avoided and to make them effective; To delete Local Policy GB4 Limited Infill – Special Policy Areas as it would not be effective and is inconsistent with national policy for the Green Belt; To alter Policy HO7 Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople to include a site allocation, so that the Plan makes provision to meet the specific need for Gypsies and Travellers arising in Castle Point during the plan period; To make detailed adjustments to particular site allocations; To delete the proposed allocation of employment land at the Manor Trading Estate, as exceptional circumstances have not been											

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			
										demonstrated for releasing the site from the Green Belt; and A number of other modifications to ensure that the plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. 5.9 Importantly, within the examination of the wLP the Inspector considered the review of the Borough's Green Belt boundaries and the methodology they adopted was clear and adequate. 5.10 It was noted at Paragraph 42 of the Inspector's Report, that the assessment of available land within the urban area (SHLAA 2018) indicated that around 53% of the housing need (5,325 for the plan period) could be met within the urban area. As such, it would not be possible to rely on increasing the supply of housing within the urban area to avoid altering the boundaries of the Green Belt to meet housing need. 5.11 The Inspector also noted 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. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
										need for housing, issues with affordability and the serious shortfall in provision of affordable homes, was a pressing matter then (intensified to the present day). They ultimately concluded that strategic-level exceptional circumstances existed to alter the Green Belt boundary in order to meet the housing needs in the interests of the proper long-term planning for the Borough. 5.12 Disappointingly, the Council resolved to withdraw the 2018-2033 Local Plan and start a new plan, focusing on protecting the Green Belt. 5.13 The Site was proposed to be released from the Green Belt and allocated as part of a wider site allocation for residential development, as part of a masterplan within the wLP 'New Castle Point Local Plan 2018 – 2033 (Policy HO20)'. The policy, referred 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			
										as Local Policy HO20 The Chase, Thundersley, sought to allocate 28ha of land off Kiln Road, Thundersley, as identified on the Policies Map, and was allocated for residential purposes, to deliver around 412 homes by 2033. Amongst other policy requirements, the policy expected a masterplan to be prepared within six months of the adoption of the Plan, to establish the capacities of development parcels within the overall site. 5.14 The proposed allocation, within the wLP was supported by a robust and reasoned evidence base, used to inform the proposed development plan. As set out above, the wLP was considered to be sound by the Inspector. 5.15 Importantly, whilst a planning application on the Site is forthcoming, we refer to a recent planning appeal decision on land further east on The Chase (ref.														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required					
												APP/M1520/W/24/3356256). The appeal for outline planning permission for 47 new dwellings on land east of Chase Mews and west of 310 The Chase, Benfleet was allowed on 6th August 2025, confirming that the site, a parcel within GB12 holding that Privo’s Site is situated, was suitable for residential development in terms of a lack of physical, ecological, environmental, or heritage constraints. Such assessment work was reviewed by the relevant statutory consultees and other stakeholders through the consideration of this application. 5.16 The Site’s potential suitability, availability and achievability was considered through the Council’s Strategic Land Availability Assessment (July 2025) (SLAA). 5.17 The SLAA considered the site in relation to 24 different suitability criteria. In relation														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 all criteria, with the exception of Local Wildlife Sites and Badger Consultation Zone noting further investigations were required, the SLAA suggested the site was suitable. Despite this, the SLAA concludes the suitability of the Site for residential development was considered unknown. 5.18 The SLAA also applies a scoring system through which sites are awarded a value relating to each one of the 24 suitability criteria. The Site scored a total of 45 using this approach, out of a maximum score of 82. This score is greater than several sites that are proposed to be allocated for residential development through the DLP, such as Land to the west of Canvey Island (score of 40). Whilst it is not considered that the process of determining site allocations can be broken down to a basic quantitative scoring exercise, these results and the conclusions in respect of 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
														Site's suitability, is concerning. Particularly in the context of a DLP which allocates insufficient land to meet housing needs, and claims it is not possible to meet development needs in full. 5.19 One of the reasons suggested by the Council's Housing Capacity Topic Paper (2025) as to why the DLP fails to meet the Borough's minimum housing requirement, is the lack of any Green Belt sites that are capable of being considered suitable from a transport or accessibility perspective, in terms compliance with NPPF paragraphs 110 and 115. The Topic Paper cites the justification for this stance as follows: "A site level sustainability and accessibility assessment was commissioned to consistently and robustly assess the sustainability of each Green Belt site's location on the transport network, and to determine through highway design if the site can 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			
										accessed by all users in a safe way, considering national design requirements” [12.6] 5.20 Concerns in terms of how the Site was considered as GB12 through the SA are set out in Section 3 of this representation. They are not repeated here, but are applicable to the soundness of the DLP, as well as relevant to considering compliance with the SEA Regulations. The Site is sustainable for residential development, as the wLP confirmed. 5.21 The Site is evidently suitable for development. Indeed, the Council’s own evidence base effectively concerns this. Green Belt 5.22 The last site-specific assessment of the Site’s contribution to the Green Belt purposes by the Council was through the Council’s Green Belt Review (GBR) 2018 Part One, in which the following was concluded (referred to as														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												Parcel 6 in the 2018 GBR: “I The parcel is located in the north of the borough and is adjacent to Thundersley along its northern, southern and western boundary, with Hadleigh adjacent to the south east boundary. There is not a clear boundary between the urban settlement and the Green Belt parcel due to the presence of ribbon development along the eastern edge and through much of the centre of the parcel. Much of this development is inappropriate in the Green Belt and therefore the parcel is assessed as making a moderate contribution to Purpose 1 even though the development which exists in the parcel is of a much lower density than that included in the urban settlement. The parcel is surrounded by residential or other built development uncharacteristic to a rural location across the entire length of its boundary 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. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required			
												coupled with the development within the parcel itself, strongly influences the perception of this parcel being in the countryside. A minor contribution is assessed under this Purpose. The parcel is assessed as not making a contribution to Purpose 2 as development of the undeveloped parts of the parcel would result in the infilling of Thundersley and not result in the merging of Thundersley and Hadleigh, which in any event have already merged at other points outside of the parcel. ” At the strategic level this Green Belt parcel is restricting a small part of Hadleigh and Thundersley from merging, although this merge has already occurred to a significant degree in close proximity. It is a fairly isolated Green Belt pocket which is only linked to the surrounding Green Belt system to the east, but it has a role in providing a recreational resource 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						
												residents in Hadleigh and Thundersley. 5.23 The relevant extract of the Council’s Green Belt Review (2018) is provided as Appendix 1. This Assessment work fed into the wLP, resulting in the site’s proposed release from the Green Belt and allocation for residential development. 5.24 The most recent Green Belt Review July 2025, builds on the 2018 GBR. The 2025 GBR assesses the parcel GB12 sub area (of which the Site is situated in) as a location for further consideration. The 2025 Assessment considers GB12 as making a weak contribution to purpose a (check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas); performing no contribution towards purpose b (to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another); a weak contribution towards purpose c (to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment). Overall scoring 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						
														'WEAK' in relation to it's performance against the purposes of the Green Belt overall (Table 10 of the GBR July 2025). 5.25 Within Appendix C of the 2025 GBR, GB12 parcel made a weak contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. The concluding commentary states: "If the sub-area were released it would be unlikely to significantly harm the performance of the wider Green Belt due to its self-contained nature within the built-up area of Thundersley and reflecting its isolation from the wider Green Belt. "Consideration should be given to any potential cumulative impacts arising in respect of the assessment of other sub-areas in close proximity..." 5.26 The relevant extract is provided as Appendix 2. 5.27 The Site and the wider Green Belt parcel clearly does not strongly contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt and is suitable for release																	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												from the Green Belt for residential development. As set out above, the Council's own evidence base suggests this to be acceptable. The site is therefore considered suitable. Availability and Achievability 5.28 The Site is subject to a lack of any significant constraints to residential development, and does not require any significant additional infrastructure to be brought forward ahead of its development. 5.29 An application will be submitted for the residential development of the Site, accompanied by technical assessment work and reports which confirm the suitability of the Site for housing. This further demonstrates the Site's deliverability. 5.30 It is being actively promoted by an experienced promoter with the agreement of the landowner. There are no ownership of other legal obstacles to the Site's development for residential use.									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 able to accommodate c.95 new homes through a development that would respect its edge of settlement location and the character of the area, and is available and achievable for 50% affordable housing that would be a significant benefit to the community, particularly in light of the Borough's acute affordable housing shortage. Overview 5.31 Given the scale of housing need within the Borough and the inability to meet this need without releasing land currently designated as Green Belt, the NPPF clearly supports the amendment of Green Belt boundaries in such circumstances. There are demonstrably suitable, available, and achievable sites for residential development currently designated as Green Belt under a significantly outdated Local Plan. The examination of the withdrawn Local									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												Plan (wLP) confirmed that amending Green Belt boundaries to help meet development needs was a sound and justified approach—even under a national policy framework that was less supportive of such changes, and at a time when the Borough’s development requirements were considerably lower than they are today. The DLP’s refusal to make any alterations to the Green Belt, despite the NPPF’s clear guidance and the outdated nature of current boundaries, renders the plan manifestly unsound. 5.32 The Site is sustainable and deliverable for residential development. 5.34 The site was included in the wLP as being suitable to accommodate residential development and to be released from the Green Belt (Policy HO20). Moreover, a recent appeal decision confirmed a lack of any constraints to the development 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	
										land further east of the Site within the same GB12 parcel as the Site, concluding the development was not inappropriate in the Green Belt. This was of course through the development management process, and a more permissive approach should be taken when considering the potential allocation of Green Belt land through the plan-making process, as was undertaken in the wLP and found to be a sound strategy. 5.35 The failure of the DLP to allocate the Site must be considered in the broader context of its inability to meet identified housing needs, and the acute shortage—particularly of affordable housing—that the current draft plan would exacerbate. 5.36 The rejection of the Site in this context means the DLP is patently unsound – it is contrary to the NPPF, contributes to the Local Plan’s failure to be positively prepared, and its													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														approach is not justified.											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0977-0001	Individual	Nicola	Stevens		Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider other alternative sites like North West Thundersley. No creditable 5 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		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		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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
														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.								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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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
0980-0001	Individual	Daniel	Stevens			Yes	SP3	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	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		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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
														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.							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 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 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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
0981-0001	Individual	Mega n	Stevens			Yes	SP3	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		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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
													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.								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 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 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				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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
0982-0001	Individual	Edward	Delahaye		Yes	SP3	No	Did not consider strategic alternatives such as North-west Thundersley. The 5 year housing land supply appears not to be credible.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	It is not consistent with national policy - it does not meet the housing target for Castle Point and the site selection ignores Green Belt / Grey Belt against NPPF guidelines. It is not justified because the site selection is based on a strategy of "no buildings on Green Belt " and the brownfield sites appear to be over-developed, resulting in the area of North-west Thundersley being excluded. I agree with the policy and stated objectives relating to the Hadleigh farm area and also, in my opinion, given the UK is not self-sufficient in food production, it cannot afford to lose viable farm land for housing. Additionally, any development south of the A13 road would have a detrimental effect upon a main road already over-burdened with traffic for long periods during the working day. I also agree that the Had2 policy is	Add North-west Thundersley to the plan. This area of 187 hectares, a mixture of Green Belt and Grey Belt, is capable of providing several thousand homes and its use would help prevent increasing the housing density of other areas in Castle Point. It use would provide a housing figure closer to the government target.	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once 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. 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
																						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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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
0983-0001	Individual	Millie	Stevens		Yes	SP3	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		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		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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
														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.							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 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 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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
0985-0001	Individual	kim	ellis			Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives, like north west Thundersly, and certain greenbelt infill sites in and around Benfleet. No credible five year housing plan.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	The draft local plan is not consistent with the national policy. It does not meet the housing target for castle point.Site selection ignores Green/grey belt against NPPF guidelines. The local plan is not justified. Site selection strategyis biasedand predetermined towards a "no greenbelt policy". Site selection is based on the "over development of brownfield sites." Not considered all sites, no greenbelt/greybelts ites added, withthe exclusion of North West Thundersly.NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at high risk of flooding. SUDS measures are not appropriatefor Canvey Islands uniquegeographya nd drainage infrastructure. The 3316 urbanhomes for Canvey is not resident led. Canvey west homes puts residents in the east at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.	Add north west thundersly, and certain statigic green/greybelt in fill sites in Benfleet Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with canvey Island at 1050.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting housing target No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley Green/Grey Belt Flood risk on Canvey Overdevelopment of brownfield sites	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government’s Standard method. However, once a	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
																						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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 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. Density The density for sites allocated within the plan has been 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	
1000-0003	Agent	Sam	Hollingworth	Rainier Developments c/o Ceres Property	Yes	SP3	No		No				4.1 Policy SP3 is fundamentally unsound. It is unjustified, fails to ensure the DLP is positively prepared, is clearly contrary to national policy, and there are substantial concerns with its effectiveness. The reasons for this are set out below. 4.2 Furthermore, it would appear the Council is itself that its DLP is highly unlikely to be found sound, as evidence by correspondence between it and the Minister of State for Housing and Planning at MHCLG, as discussed within this section. Quantum 4.3 Policy SP3 suggests the DLP will deliver 6,196 homes over the period 2026-2043, which equates to an average of 364 dpa. This is despite acknowledging at paragraph 6.52 that its housing requirement for this period is 11,662 (albeit, seemingly not recognising that this is a minimum) as per the NPPF and the approach to calculating local housing needs set		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes - See attachments	B - updated attachments	<u>Housing Supply</u> Suggests conflicts with NPPF and PPG <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> The substantial shortfall in housing provision proposed by the DLP is evidently a consequence of its refusal to amend the Borough's Green Belt boundaries. The DLP adopts an overly rigid, almost sacrosanct approach to the Green Belt, which is fundamentally at odds with national planning policy. In contrast, the NPPF makes clear that Green Belt boundaries can be altered through the Local Plan process where justified by exceptional circumstances, such as meeting identified housing needs. Highlights changes to NPPF Green/Grey Belt classification.. <u>Timescales for Delivery</u> In addition to concerns regarding the overall quantum of housing proposed, there		<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. Within the NPPF Paragraph 11 section b (a) and (ii) give an acknowledgement of circumstances in which national policy does not expect Standard Method outcomes to be met in full. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply and Timescales</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Densities</u> Policy Hou3 indicates the housing mix, including in Premium sustainability areas. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment		See Schedule of Modifications re: flooding

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														out in the PPG. 4.4 Assuming the DLP were to deliver all the homes it purports to (and there are substantial doubts that it will, as we discuss later within this representation), this will leave a shortfall of 5,466 dwellings over the plan period. The DLP is seeking to provide just 53% of what the NPPF expressly requires the DLP to deliver as a minimum. There are no indications that there are robust arrangements in place to ensure that the Borough's residual local housing need will be met elsewhere within the housing market area. 4.5 The Council's approach is clearly contrary to the NPPF. Not only that, but contrary to an aspect of the NPPF which the Government makes clear is critical for Local Planning Authorities to address as part of its approach to dealing with the national housing crisis. 4.6 Even if one were to ignore that the DLP's approach						are also significant issues with the timing of delivery set out in Policy SP3. Not only will the DLP fail to address local housing needs as per the NPPF, but the strategy will mean the shortage will be particularly acute in the first 10 years of the plan period. <u>Densities</u> The DLP suggests the proposed approach will require a density of 150 dph – an extremely high density compared to existing development within the Borough, and one that will necessitate flattened development. There is a lack of evidence to substantiate if it is even feasible for a development of this nature could be delivered whilst also providing for a variety of house types as needed and / or meeting the development management standards the DLP proposes. <u>Flood Risk</u> The NPPF is clear that development	(SFRA). Emergency Planning 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. Needs of emergency services considered in 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
										to addressing need is in direct contradiction to the NPPF and PPG, the social and economic harm of failing to meet housing needs is vast, for the reasons we set out in Section 3 of this representation. However, such matters do not appear to have been given due consideration in determining the number of new homes. 4.7 In Section 3 of this representation, we set out our concerns pertaining to Policy SP3 in terms of the SA and the SEA Regulations. Plainly, such concerns also go to the soundness of the DLP, particularly insofar as concerns the need for Local Plans to be justified and the important role sustainability appraisal should play in this. It is clear from the SA that the DLP's purported justification for failing to meet housing needs is based on specious reasoning which fails to properly evaluate the effects of seeking							should be directed away from areas at higher risk of flooding. Given that there are alternative sites within the Borough subject to lower flood risk—which have been rejected—the DLP's approach in this regard is not justified. The DLP does not appear to be supported by a sequential test that could justify such an approach as the NPPF requires. Even if it could be shown to pass the sequential test, there is a lack of evidence to confirm development would be capable of passing the exceptions test for development in areas of flood risk. To rely so heavily on the delivery of such a development site, fundamental to the DLP's proposed housing strategy, is unjustified and alarming. <u>HSE Hazardous Installations Consultation Zone</u> The proposals appear to focus				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 meet housing needs versus failing to do so, particularly in respect of affordable housing. 4.8 The DLP's significant shortfall in proposed housing provision when compared to the minimum number required to ensure the DLP is capable of being found sound is evidently a function of the Council's refusal to make any alterations to the Borough's Green Belt. The DLP suggests a sacral approach to the Green Belt which is totally at odds with national planning policy. On the contrary, the NPPF makes clear that the preparation of a Local Plan is the appropriate vehicle through which to amend Green Belt boundaries, and that the inability to otherwise meet housing needs is justification for makes such changes. 4.9 It is notable that the Council previously prepared a Local Plan in the context of the 2021 NPPF, which included limited release of Green Belt, and							significant scale development in the HSE Hazardous Installations Consultation Zone. There are two Upper Tier COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazard) sites located on Canvey Island. It is unclear if the HSE would consider West Canvey an appropriate location to which to direct significant scale housing growth.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
										sought to deliver 5,510 new homes for the Borough between 2018 and 2032, an average of 367 dpa. This Local Plan was examined and found to be sound subject to main modifications, but ultimately withdrawn by the Council. The withdrawn, but sound, Local Plan ('the wLP')'s approach to making alterations to the Green Belt boundary in order to address housing needs was found to be consistent with the relevant national planning policy at that time, which was less permissive to such an approach than the current national planning policy with which the DLP must accord. 4.10 In terms of changes to the NPPF and PPG since the wLP, three key aspects merit highlighting: the NPPF is now expressly clear that exceptional circumstances which justify alterations to the Green Belt through a Local Plan include, but are not limited to, where													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														an Authority cannot otherwise meet housing needs; grey belt – a new category of Green Belt land, which does not contribute strongly to purposes (a), (b) or (d) – should be considered as part of a Green Belt review and prioritised for release ahead of other greenfield Green Belt land; the minimum housing requirement for which the Borough needs to plan has increased substantially, strengthening the case that alterations to the Green Belt are necessary. 4.11 The Council's Castle Point Green Belt Assessment (July 2025) identifies a number of potential grey belt sites within the Borough. We consider that there are additional grey belt sites this assessment should have identified, as discussed in our Section 6 of this representation. In any case, the key point insofar as concerns Policy SP3 is that there are evidently Green Belt sites that do											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 strongly contribute to purposes (a), (b) or (d) of the Green Belt and could be utilised to increase housing provision. Even if development of such land would not meet needs in full, it could reduce the shortfall compared to current proposals. 4.12 The Council's Housing Capacity Topic Paper 2025 makes reference to Borough's Green Belt being "heavily constrained...[but] even with potentially unconstrained areas, sustainable accessibility and infrastructure deliverability present significant barrier to development" (page 66). However, the DLP lacks any robust evidence to demonstrate that there are no Green Belt sites subject to such constraints that they cannot sustainably provide homes for the Borough. 4.13 For example, in seeking to justify the DLP's approach, and in respect of transport and sustainable													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required				
												access, the Council’s Housing Capacity Topic Paper 2025 asserts at paragraph 12.9 that sites on the edge of settlements do not have access to services or public transport provision, and that Green Belt sites promoted would not be developed at a density that would enable public transport services to be sustained. At 12.12 it goes on to conclude: “It is therefore appropriate and in accordance with the NPPF to avoid development in the Green Belt as it would not be sustainably located and would impact on traffic capacity on the local and strategic highway network. This is consistent with paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF.” 4.14 Even if one were to overlook that edge of settlement sites are not inherently remote from services or public transport opportunities, or that sustainable transport is not limited to public transport, 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		
												conclusion fails to consider potential mitigation measures that might be required. In any case, the Council's own evidence does not support this position adopted by the Housing Capacity Topic Paper – the Green Belt Site Assessment (July 2025) suggests there are Green Belt sites that have been promoted that are capable of being considered suitable from a transport and accessibility perspective and are capable of complying with NPPF paragraphs 110 and 115. 4.15 Separately, we note that the Council wrote to Matt Pennycook, the Minister of State for Housing and Planning at MHCLG on 4 April 2025, setting out concerns in terms of the Council's ability to address the minimum housing requirement in the preparation of a new Local Plan; and confirming that the Council considers there is to be significant risk that its											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required					
												proposed approach through the DLP will be found to be unsound when considered against the NPPF. The response from the Minister of State (30 June 2025) made clear that the Council is expected to quickly bring forward a Local Plan that can be found sound. Given this exchange, it is far from clear why the Council has subsequently prepared and published for consultation the DLP in its current form. To proceed to submission and examination of the DLP in its current form would not only engender soundness concerns, but with expectations that the DLP would be found unsound, it would be a highly questionable use of public resources. Timescales for Delivery 4.16 There are concerns with temporal aspects of Policy SP3, in addition to the overall quantum of housing proposed. 4.17 Not only will the DLP fail to address local housing needs as per the NPPF, but														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 strategy will mean the shortage will be particularly acute in the first 10 years of the plan period. 4.18 Policy SP3 suggests that in the first five years of the plan period (2026-2031), the DLP will seek to provide for an average of 209 dpa (just 30% of its local housing need); rising to 253 dpa for the period 2031-2036 (37% of its local housing need); and then stepping up significantly, albeit still substantially short of the 686 dpa minimum, to 554 dpa from 2031-2043. 4.19 This temporal aspect of Policy SP3 is particularly problematic for the following three reasons. 4.20 Firstly, there is an urgent local need for housing, , now – the delivery of homes is not a matter than can simply be deferred until a later date. 4.21 Secondly, the PPG is clear that if a housing trajectory is to be stepped, there should be clear justification for doing so and that it must ensure housing needs 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			
										met in full in the plan period. In the DLP's case, neither criterion has been met. 4.22 Thirdly, the LHNA identifies that whilst the affordable housing need for the Borough over the plan period totals 3,976 dwellings, there are an is estimated 3,220 households in the Borough currently living in unsuitable housing and are unable to afford their own housing, i.e. the vast majority of the community's affordable housing needs are an immediate need. The DLP failure to plan positively to deliver homes, including affordable housing, in the early part of the plan period will have significant negative social repercussions for the Borough. Deliverability 4.23 Policy SP3 places significant reliance on redevelopment of urban sites on Canvey Island in order to achieve its proposed housing figure of 6,196 homes. 4.24 3,143 new homes 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					
												proposed to be delivered in this manner – 51% of the total for the Borough. Of these, 2,000 homes are proposed to be delivered through redevelopment of land at West Canvey (Policy C4). It is not clear if this site is suitable, available or achievable for development. As the DLP itself notes, the land is currently in use as employment sites and retail park, and is well occupied by a mix of uses. 4.25 The DLP suggests the proposed approach will require a density of 150 dph – an extremely high density compared to existing development within the Borough, and one that will necessitate flattened development. It is far from clear if such development could be delivered whilst also providing for a variety of house types as needed and / or meeting the development management standards the DLP proposes. 4.26 Furthermore, the location is within Flood Zone 3														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
												– land at greatest risk of flooding from tidal or fluvial sources. The NPPF is clear on the need to steer development away from such areas, and given that there are options for development in areas of the Borough that are subject to lesser degrees of flood risk, but which have been rejected, the DLP’s approach is not justified in this regard. The DLP does not appear to be supported by a sequential test that could justify such an approach as the NPPF requires. Even if it could be shown to pass the sequential test, there is a lack of evidence to confirm development would be capable of passing the exceptions test for development in areas of flood risk. 4.27 Additionally, this area has some of the weakest connectivity and access to sustainable forms of transport relative to other parts of the Borough. It is particularly detached from the Borough’s railway											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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, for example. 4.28 Finally, the proposals appear to focus significant scale development in the HSE Hazardous Installations Consultation Zone. There are two Upper Tier COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazard) sites located on Canvey Island. It is unclear if the HSE would consider West Canvey an appropriate location to which to direct significant scale housing growth. 4.29 A number of the DLP's allocations, relied upon to deliver a significant proportion of the new homes proposed, lack evidence of deliverability. The DLP may deliver far fewer homes in actuality than it purports to, exacerbating the already substantial shortfall of proposed provision compared with local housing needs.											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1000-0005	Agent	Sam	Hollingworth	Rainier Developments c/o Ceres Property	Yes	SP3	No		No				6.1 This section of our representation concerns the DLP's site selection process insofar as it concerns site GB14 / (Site ID40101) / Land South of Daws Heath Road, Thundersley ('the Site'). 6.2 It is noted that the DLP fails to allocate any Green Belt land for residential development. The Council's evidence to support such a stance is highly questionable, given that the WLP was only recently examined, through which it was confirmed that the allocation of multiple sites within the Green Belt was a sound approach. Subsequently, and in the context of the DLP, the Borough's minimum housing requirement is significantly greater; and the NPPF and PPG are clear on both the need to amend Green Belt boundaries where housing needs cannot otherwise be met, and on the need to take a more permissive approach to		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes - See attachments	B - updated attachments	Makes case for the inclusion of Site GB14.	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
												considering the suitability of allocating Green Belt land for development. In this context, the Council's stance set out in the DLP cannot be justified. Sustainability / Suitability 6.3 The Site adjoins the existing residential envelope of a settlement identified as sustainable to accommodate proportionate growth in the current Development Plan. It adjoins existing residential areas. 6.4 The Site is not subject to any physical, environmental, ecological or heritage constraints that suggest it would be unsuitable for residential development. The Site's only constraint to development is that it is located on land designated as Green Belt in the Development Plan, which dates back to 1998 – a policy constraint, and one shared by the vast majority of land with the potential to contribute to the Borough's needs.									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
												6.5 A planning application made in respect of the Site in 2023 (reference 23/0104/OUT) confirmed the suitability of the Site for residential development in terms of a lack of physical, ecological, environmental, or heritage constraints. Such assessment work was reviewed by the relevant statutory consultees and other stakeholders through the consideration of this application. 6.6 Application 23/0104/OUT was subject to a non-determination appeal ((APP/M1520/W/23/3329585) which was dismissed on the grounds that the very special circumstances required to justify such development in the Green Belt had not been demonstrated in the case of that specific application. 6.7 The Site's potential suitability, availability and achievability was considered through the Council's										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
												Strategic Land Availability Assessment (July 2025) (SLAA). 6.8 The SLAA considered the site in relation to 24 different suitability criteria. In relation to every one of these, the SLAA suggested the site was suitable. Despite this, the SLAA concludes the suitability of the Site for residential development is questionable. The justification for this is far from clear. 6.9 The SLAA also applies a scoring system through which sites are awarded a value relating to each one of the 24 suitability criteria. The Site scored a total of 61 using this approach, out of a maximum score of 82. This score is greater than several sites that are proposed to be allocated for residential development through the DLP, such as Land to the west of Canvey Island (score of 40); and Manor Trading Estate (score of 58). Whilst it is not considered that the process of determining site											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name		Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required				
											allocations can be distilled down to a basic quantitative scoring exercise, these results, the conclusions in respect of the Site's suitability, and the approach to site selection having regard to this is very questionable. Particularly in the context of a DLP which allocates insufficient land to meet housing needs, and claims it is not possible to meet development needs in full. 6.10 One of the reasons suggested by the Council's Housing Capacity Topic Paper (2025) as to why the DLP fails to meet the Borough's minimum housing requirement, is the lack of any Green Belt sites that are capable of being considered suitable from a transport or accessibility perspective, in terms of compliance with NPPF paragraphs 110 and 115. The Topic Paper cites the justification for this stance as follows: "A site level sustainability and accessibility																

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						
														assessment was commissioned to consistently and robustly assess the sustainability of each Green Belt site's location on the transport network, and to determine through highway design if the site can be accessed by all users in a safe way, considering national design requirements” [12.6] 6.11 However, this assessment (Green Belt Site Access Assessment (July 2025)) found that GB14 was one of a small number of Green Belt sites that is capable of being delivered in a manner which accords with NPPF paragraphs 110 and 115. This is consistent with the appeal decision in respect of this site, discussed in Section 3 of this representation, in which no concerns vis-à-vis the site's residential development and transport, accessibility, or highways impacts were found. 6.12 Concerns in terms of how the Site was considered as GB14 through 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 are set out in Section 3 of this representation. They are not repeated here, but are applicable to the soundness of the DLP, as well as relevant to considering compliance with the SEA Regulations. 6.13 The Site is sustainable for residential development, as the appeal decision in respect of APP/M1520/W/23/3329585 confirmed. 6.14 The Site is evidently suitable for development. Indeed, the Council’s own evidence base effectively concerns this, with the exception of the fact the Site is on land currently designated as Green Belt. This is discussed below. Green Belt 6.15 The last site-specific assessment of the Site’s contribution to the Green Belt purposes by the Council was through the Council’s Green Belt Boundary Review 2013, in which the following was concluded: “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		
										could be redefined in this location using existing field boundaries, tree belts and ancient woodland, and existing residential development, all of which are readily recognisable physical features. “There is some concern over the potential narrowing of the western edge of the Daws Heath Ring part of the Green Belt, however it is considered that a form of development could be achieved in this location, which integrates into the existing landscape and pattern of development in this area. “A redefined boundary would still allow for this part of the Green Belt to fulfil its purposes”. 6.16 The relevant extract of the Council’s Green Belt Review (2013) is provided as Appendix 1. 6.17 Separately, as noted above, an appeal for a proposed residential development of the Site (‘the 2024 Appeal’) was dismissed in 2024, when 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						
												considered that very special circumstances to justify residential development in the Green Belt had not been demonstrated in that instance. 6.18 It is important to recognise that, firstly, as confirmed through the judgment in Compton7 the ‘very special circumstances’ test for permitting inappropriate development in the Green Belt is a higher and more demanding test than the ‘exceptional circumstances’ test applied to altering Green Belt boundaries at the plan-making stage. 6.19 Secondly, in terms of the Site’s contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt, the appeal decision predated the current NPPF and PPG, and their definition of grey belt and methodology for assessing the contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. 6.20 The NPPF defines grey belt as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of Green Belt purposes (a), (b), or (d) in. The definition excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in NPPF footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development. 6.21 In relation to purpose (a) (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas), Thundersley is a town, and as such constitutes a large built-up area for the purposes of considering the Site's contribution to the Green Belt. 6.22 In the 2024 Appeal decision, the Inspector concluded that: "Woodland would restrict further spread of Thundersley towards Daws Heath. In that sense, the proposal would not lead to totally 'unrestricted' sprawl and the integrity of the wider Green Belt between														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
												Thundersley and Daws Heath in serving this purpose would not be wholly undermined by the proposal” ⁸ 6.23 However, the Inspector went on to opine that: “There would be a close physical link between development on the site and Nos 154-164 and given the proximity, I agree with comments made by the appellants at the Hearing that these bungalows would be ‘tied in’ with Thundersley and would relate in stronger fashion to it. In my view, the proposal would lead to these dwellings being read and appreciated as part of Thundersley in contrast to the existing impression of a standalone group and consequently the further outward expansion of Thundersley beyond the site. As a result, I cannot agree that the site as a whole is very well contained or that sprawl would be limited to the appeal site as the appellants asserted”.											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required				
												6.24 The 2024 Appeal decision predates updates to the PPG that set out how the various levels of contributions to the Green Belt should be assessed. As such it is appropriate to revisit these conclusions in the context of the PPG. 6.25 The PPG explains that sites making a strong contribution to this purpose are likely to be free of existing development and lack physical features in reasonable proximity that could restrict and contain development. 6.26 In the case of the Site, it adjoins the existing settlement to its west. To the south and east of the Site, any potential future incursion of development into the Green Belt is prevented by the presence of dense woodland, protected from removal / development by its Ancient Woodland designation. To the north, Daws Heath Road provides a clear boundary of substantial													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required								
													permanence. 6.27 There is nothing within the PPG to support the view that a change in the relationship between the existing bungalows at 154-164 Daws Heath Road could constitute harm to purpose (a) of the Green Belt. On the contrary, the PPG now states that where sites lack physical features that could restrict or contain development, such land might be capable of being found to make a strong contribution. In this instance, the existing dwellings to the south of Daws Heath Road, and riding school buildings, evidently provide physical features which act to contain the Site. Furthermore, to the south and east of this neighbouring development, further woodland areas restrict the possibility for any future encroachment into the Green Belt. 6.28 A Landscape, Visual and Green Belt Assessment (LVGA) has been prepared which considers a specific proposed																		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 for the Site, including in relation to the current NPPF and PPG on Green Belt. A copy of this LVGA is provided as Appendix 2. The LVGA assessed the Site's contribution to purpose (a) as weak / none. 6.29 Turning to purpose (b) (to prevent merging towns merging into one another) this was evidently a determinative factor in the dismissal of the 2024 Appeal. Specifically, in relation to the separation of Thundersley and Daws Heath. The Inspector in the 2024 Appeal expressly stated (at paragraph 28) that Daws Heath is a village; but noted that the Council's Castle Point Borough Green Belt Review – Part 1 (2018) (GBR) considers Daws Heath as a town. 6.30 Subsequently, the PPG has clarified that purpose (b) relates to the merging of towns, and expressly states it is not relevant to villages. 6.31 The 2024 Appeal decision														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 that Daws Heath was a village. A subsequent appeal decision9 (451-469 Daws Heath Road) reaffirmed this view, but in this case expressly in relation to the definition of grey belt. 6.32 Consequently, as confirmed in 451-469 Daws Heath Road, purpose (b) of the Green Belt is not relevant to the village of Daws Heath, and thus not relevant to the Site. 6.33 In any case, the PPG now confirms that areas which are likely to make a strong contribution to purpose (b) of the Green Belt are likely to be free of existing development, and form a substantial part of a gap between settlements the development of which would be likely to result in a loss of visual separation of towns. 6.34 As the 2024 Appeal Decision confirmed, the gap between the Site and Daws Heath is not free from existing														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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; and there would be no intervisibility between the proposed development and the edge of Daws Heath. 6.35 As such, the Site could not be considered to make a strong contribution to Green Belt purpose (b) and prevention of coalescence between Daws Heath and Thundersley. even if the status of Daws Heath as a village was to be (unreasonably) ignored. 6.36 The LVGA assesses the Site's contribution to purpose (b) as weak / none. 6.37 In respect of purpose (d), the 2024 Appeal did not suggest the Site made any contribution to this. Very few sites do, as few Green Belts perform the role of preserving the setting or special character of any historic town. Thundersley is not an historic town in this context, and thus the Site cannot make any significant contribution to purpose (d). 6.38 The NPPF															

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						
														Annex 2 confirms that the definition of grey belt excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development. These include Local Green Space, a National Landscape, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments) and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change. None of these apply to the Site. 6.39 Having regard to all of the above, the Site is considered to meet the definition of grey belt. Availability and Achievability 6.40 The Site 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
										subject to a lack of any significant constraints to residential development, and does not require any significant additional infrastructure to be brought forward ahead of it providing homes. 6.41 An application has been submitted for the residential development of the Site, accompanied by technical assessment work and reports which confirm the suitability of the Site for housing. This further demonstrates the Site's deliverability. 6.42 It is being actively promoted by an experienced promoter with the agreement of the landowner. There are no ownership of other legal obstacles to the Site's development for residential use. It is able to accommodate c.58 new homes through a development that would respect its edge of settlement location and the character of the area, and is available and achievable for 50% affordable												

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										housing – c.29 affordable homes that would be a significant benefit to the community, particularly in light of the Borough’s acute affordable housing shortage. Overview 6.43 In the context of the Borough’s housing need and inability to meet this without impinging on the current Green Belt, the NPPF makes clear the need to amend Green Belt boundaries. There are evidently suitable, available and achievable sites for residential development which are currently designated as Green Belt in a very out of date Local Plan. The examination of the wLP confirmed that amending the Green Belt boundary to help address development needs was a sound approach, even in the context of national policy which was much less positive on taking such an approach, as well as the Borough’s development requirements being much less than exists today. 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			
											DLP's refusal to make any alterations to the Green Belt, despite the NPPF's clear exhortation to do so in these circumstances, and the current boundaries being based on a wholly out of date Local Plan, renders the DLP manifestly unsound. 6.44 The Site is sustainable and deliverable for residential development. 6.45 It is grey belt land that should be prioritised for allocation through the new Local Plan. 6.46 A relatively recent appeal decision confirmed a lack of any constraints to the development of the Site, with the exception of national Green Belt policy as it then was. This was of course through the development management process, and a more permissive approach should be taken when considering the potential allocation of Green Belt land through the plan-making process. Furthermore, the NPPF and PPG have been															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required				
											amended in terms of how the appraisal of Green Belt for allocation for development should be considered, which results in a very different conclusion when considering the Site's contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt than that reached in respect of the appeal. This stance is supported by a LVGA which accompanies this representation, and which concludes the Site is grey belt as defined by the NPPF and PPG. 6.47 The failure of the DLP to allocate the Site should be seen alongside its failure to ensure housing needs will be met, and the acute shortage – particular of affordable homes – the DLP as currently drafted would engender. 6.48 The rejection of the Site in this context means the DLP is patently unsound – it is contrary to the NPPF, contributes to the Local Plan's failure to be positively prepared, and its approach is not justified.																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0946-0001	Individual	WILLIAM	Blissett	RESIDENT	Yes	SP3	No	Failing to adequately consider alternative sites across the Borough including North West Thundersley /Blinking Owl site. There is no credible 5year housing land supply. Failure in 'Duty to cooperate' with other Authorities including Essex County Council and Anglian Water.	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The draft Local plan is not consistent with National Policy. It does not meet the housing targets for Castle Point. Development should be directed away from areas of highest flood risk. Canvey Island has the highest flood risk rating in the Borough and yet has been allocated the largest number of houses of all the Borough areas. The surface and foul water drainage systems on Canvey Island have reached capacity and will not cope with so many additional homes . By building so many new homes the natural drainage on the Island is significantly reduced. The Castle Point draft Plan will be detrimental to the Health and Wellbeing of Island residents. The road network on the Island is at capacity and would not cope with so many additional vehicles.		The North West Thundersley / Blinking Owl site should be included in the plan. This is an ideal site for the development of a whole new village with all of the required infrastructure. The Urban Housing target for Canvey Island and the Borough should be reduced with consideration given to development on greybelt and appropriate greenbelt sites. Potential dwellings on Charfleets Industrial Estate should be removed.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West Thundersley No five year housing land supply No Duty to cooperate Not meeting housing targets Flood Risk on Canvey Green/Grey belt Concerned about the impact of C4 on residents and businesses.	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. 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 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	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
												Proper consultation with the businesses on Charfleets has not taken place. The type of businesses do not lend themselves to having flats above them. Such a large scale redevelopment of the Estate is not practical and would drive many businesses into bankruptcy These businesses would not be able to afford future higher rents.. Many of the businesses own their sites so in some instances compulsory purchase would be necessary.							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 housing topic paper. 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. 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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. 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 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. Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After		

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
																					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 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. C4 concerns on residents and businesses This states at paragraph 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
0283-0001	Organisation	Emma	Goodings	Rochford District Council	Not Stated	SP3	No	Rochford District Council (RDC) does not consider the Castle Point Local Plan (CPLP) to be legally compliant due to its failure to meet its standard methodology housing need requirement as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Paragraph 62 of the NPPF states that “to determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need	No	Positively Prepared, Justified, Consistent with National Policy	Positively Prepared: RDC does not consider the CPLP to be positively prepared, as required by paragraph 36(a) of the NPPF. The CPLP fails to set out a clear and deliverable housing strategy for meeting the Borough’s standard method housing need requirement in full. The plan does not demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been considered, including those that would meet the full housing need. The evidence-base provides limited justification for the dismissal of spatial strategy options that might have enabled the Borough to meet its full housing need. Furthermore, the CPLP does not provide an agreed approach with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Co-operate through which the Borough’s unmet housing need could be addressed. RDC reiterates that it is not able to take on any unmet housing	RDC does not consider the CPLP to be legally compliant and/or sound primarily due to the failure of the CPLP to set out a clear and deliverable housing strategy that meets the Borough’s housing need in full, as calculated using the standard method in line with paragraph 62 of the NPPF. Whilst RDC acknowledges that Castle Point faces notable physical and environmental constraints, the technical evidence-base provides limited justification for the dismissal of alternative spatial strategy options that might have enabled the Borough to meet its housing need in full. There is insufficient evidence that all reasonable alternatives—including those that would meet the full housing need—have been robustly assessed and justified. To ensure the CPLP is legally compliant and sound, further evaluation and	Not Stated		No	A	Considers that the local plan is not compliant or sound as the housing strategy does not meet all of the housing need calculated by the standard methodology but recognises that CP has significant environmental and physical constraints to meeting its housing need. RDC raised concerns about CP housing strategy approach in previous responses. Does not support policy as does not meet the identified standard method housing need requirement in full. Limited justification to support shortfall and dismissal of alternative spatial options. Asserts that no agreement exists with neighbouring authorities to assist with unmet housing need. No concerns over sites allocated some comments raised for Thun2	CPBC has considered what housing delivery can be realistically achieved within its boundaries taking into account its significant environmental and infrastructure restraints as well as its market capacity.	This has been rigorously evidenced through the Green Belt Assessment July 2025 which reviewed all potential sites within Castle Point’s Green Belt, these sites were then considered against further criteria including: environmental and heritage designations, flood risk, highways issues which impact viability, sustainability as well as having regard for the Essex LNRS and strategic opportunity areas for biodiversity improvements.	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within The Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2023.	Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period.	CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery.	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
							assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning practice guidance.” For Castle Point, the standard method identifies a requirement for the delivery of 11,662 new dwellings over the proposed Local Plan period (2026 to 2043). However, Policy SP3 includes a housing strategy that delivers a minimum of 6,196 new dwellings over the local plan period, resulting in a significant shortfall. In previous consultation responses, RDC raised concerns over			need from Castle Point, and no evidence has been presented to suggest that such redistribution has been agreed or is deliverable. Justified: RDC does not consider the CPLP to be justified as required by paragraph 36(b) of the NPPF. The plan lacks a full and transparent assessment of alternative spatial strategy options, including those that would meet the full housing need, and does not provide sufficient evidence to justify the chosen approach. Additionally, the CPLP does not demonstrate how unmet housing need would be addressed through cooperation with neighbouring authorities, and RDC confirms that it cannot accommodate any such unmet need. Consistent with National Policy: RDC does not consider the CPLP to be consistent with national policy, as required by paragraph 36(d) of the NPPF. The CPLP fails to set out a clear and	testing through the technical evidence-base should be undertaken to ensure that the housing strategy is both justifiable and deliverable. For example, the transport assessment should be used to assess the cumulative impact of growth at the standard method housing need requirement on the local and strategic transport network. This would allow for a more informed understanding of infrastructure requirements and can be used to justify the scale and distribution of growth considered sustainable, acceptable and deliverable for the Borough. In addition, the CPLP must clearly demonstrate how the Borough intends to meet its housing need in full, or provide robust evidence of agreed arrangements with neighbouring authorities. RDC confirms that it is not able to accommodate any unmet housing					housing need. States that CP has not provided an agreed approach via the DtC with neighbouring authorities on how its unmet housing need could be addressed RDC considers there is a lack of technical justification and robust evidence to support the shortfall in housing delivery particularly with regards the assessment of reasonable alternatives of sites located within the Green Belt. Suggests technical evidence could include further transport assessment on the cumulative impact of growth across South Essex	CPBC notes that BBC is unable to assist CPBC in meeting its unmet housing need. CPBC has followed the EPOA protocol for considering unmet housing need and has requested assistance from all its neighbouring authorities to help with meeting its unmet housing need. No authority was able to assist. CPBC has considered what housing delivery can be realistically achieved within its boundaries taking into account its significant environmental and infrastructure restraints as well as its market capacity. This has been rigorously evidenced through the Green Belt Assessment July 2025 which reviewed all potential sites within Castle Point’s Green Belt, these sites were then considered against further criteria including: environmental and heritage designations, flood risk, highways issues which impact viability, sustainability as well as having regard for the Essex LNRS and strategic opportunity areas for biodiversity improvements. Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined in The Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
								strategy options that would not meet Castle Point's housing need requirement in full and strongly advised CPBC to pursue a strategy that would meet the standard methodology requirements. RDC acknowledges that Castle Point faces notable physical and environmental constraints , including a substantial proportion of land designated as Green Belt (55.9%) and a significant proportion falling within Flood Risk Zone 3 (~50%). However, RDC's			deliverable housing strategy for meeting the Borough's standard method housing need requirement in full. The absence of a justified strategy for addressing unmet need through cooperation further undermines consistency with national policy.		need from Castle Point, and no such agreement currently exists.							has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery. CPBC notes that RDC is unable to assist CPBC in meeting its unmet housing need. CPBC has followed the EPOA protocol for considering unmet housing need and has requested assistance from all its neighbouring authorities. No authority was able to assist.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
0993-0001	Individual	Satvinder	Juttla			Yes	SP3	No	The document illustrates the positives of building in the area and fails to highlight the current residence who currently suffer from various fails from GP surgeries to non stop heavy buildup of traffic.	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	This area is already too busy and adding more houses is going to cause further problems for both current and new occupiers.		No	Not Answered	Not Answered			Infrastructure concerns		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
0947-0001	Agent	Liam	Ryder	Roscon Group c/o CODE Development Planners Ltd	Yes	SP3	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	No	Positively prepared, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Paragraphs 11a) and b) of the NPPF are clear that all local plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to meet, as a minimum, the objectively assessed needs of local planning authority, in addition to aligning growth and infrastructure. Furthermore, paragraph 61 of the NPPF emphasises the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes by aiming to meet an area's identified housing need. The NPPF therefore leaves local planning authorities in no doubt that it is expected that objectively assessed needs will be met in full.	To be positively prepared, the Castle Point plan should, as a minimum, be planning to meet its objectively assessed housing needs. There is an acute need for new market and affordable homes across the borough.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Concerns over SA. Concerns over Duty to Cooperate.	Duty to Cooperate: Addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. All reasonable sites and options were considered in the SA.	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						
								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				annum, or 11,662 dwellings over the same period. The NPPF is clear that "strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning practice guidance." Referring to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), paragraph 3 states, "The standard method should be used to assess housing needs. However it is recognised that there are some specific circumstances in which an alternative approach could be justified, for example as explained at paragraph 14 below." Paragraph 14 refers specifically to circumstances in which strategic policy-making authority boundaries do not align with local planning authority boundaries, which is not applicable to CPBC. Furthermore, paragraph 15 considers how																	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
												out in policy SP1, by impacting on protected areas and frustrating a landscape scale approach to green infrastructure and nature recovery.” The NPPF is clear that, once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified through the preparation or updating of plans. Paragraph 146 of the NPPF stipulates, “Exceptional circumstances in this context include, but are not limited to, instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes...through other means. If that is the case, authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in this Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine 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	
								te 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				allocation to assist in meeting the objectively assessed needs of the area. As highlighted further in these representations, CODE does not consider any such consideration has been undertaken by CPBC, which is a fundamental failing of the evidence base which demonstrates the plan is not justified, or positively prepared. In addition, CODE notes the letter received by CPBC from Matthew Pennycook MP, the Minister of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, on 30 June 2025, further to a letter sent by CPBC on 4 April 2025 in which it highlighted concerns regarding its ability to meet the housing needs identified by the standard method. However, in the MP’s response, it is stated, “I note the concerns you raise in your letter. However, I must tell you in all candour that Castle Point is not unique in facing challenges 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. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								19 draft Castle Point Plan and has specified the level of unmet need.”					bringing forward a local plan that meets the needs of the community... It is perfectly clear that Castle Point officers are capable of delivering a sound plan for councillors, having done so in 2022. Unfortunately, due to previous decisions to not adopt the sound plan, the authority finds itself with one of the worst plan making track records in the country and one of the oldest local plans. This puts the Council in the bottom 2% of the country.									
								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					Having received substantial support, it is now your responsibility to make the decisions needed to deliver an ambitious local plan to unlock growth and secure the housing, jobs and infrastructure that Castle Point so desperately needs.”									
													The housing minister finally confirms his expectation that CPBC brings forward a plan that is capable of being									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							whether development needs that cannot be met wholly within a particular area could be met elsewhere. "					found sound quickly. At the time of writing, the Castle Point Plan's approach to meeting defined housing needs is not sound. There is no justification for the alternative approach advanced by CPBC.									
							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					An ambitious plan which seeks to meet defined housing needs across a portfolio of sites both on brownfield and greenfield (and thereby Green Belt) can appropriately plan for associated infrastructure improvements to facilitate the level of growth across the borough, as has been proven by the previous Local Plan found sound in 2022. The brownfield led approach will similarly fail to meet anticipated affordable housing needs. There has been a significant decrease in affordable housing being delivered in the borough (against an already abysmal record) since the introduction of CPBC's CIL Charging Schedule (adopted 1 May									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required					
										throughout the preparation of the Castle Point Plan and cannot be applied retrospectively.		2023). The enclosed appendix demonstrates several sites where viability assessments have been used to revise levels of affordable housing to be provided (viability assessments have been used to justify no provision of affordable housing on brownfield sites). To be positively prepared, the Castle Point plan should, as a minimum, be planning to meet its objectively assessed housing needs. There is an acute need for new market and affordable homes across the borough. Whilst there are constraints identified in the borough (and on some Green Belt land), the constraints are not ‘strong’ reasons for restricting the overall scale and distribution of development in the plan area (as prescribed by paragraph 11(b) of the NPPF).														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
0995-0001	Individual	Michelle	Baldwin			Yes	SP3	No	canvey island is a flood risk area and they are proposing to build 3000+ houses, there is not enough infrastructure for the people who live there with the need for a third road being necessary	No	Justified	too many sites on canvey		less housing and more infrastructure	No	Not Answered	Not Answered			Floodrisk on canvey Third road		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 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 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 through the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation	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
																			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.		
0999-0001	Individual	Andrew	Iredale		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	Too many houses for the infrastructure.	The number of houses proposed for exceeds the surrounding infrastructure of streets, health and education facilities.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Infrastructure concerns	Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N		
0947-0006	Agent	Liam	Ryder	Roscon Group c/o CODE Development Planners Ltd	Yes	SP3	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	No	Positively prepared	The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) Methodology Report (January 2023) confirms that the Council has used the Urban Intelligence Place Maker tool, which relies on Land Registry data and artificial intelligence (AI) to identify vacant and underutilised land within urban areas. While AI is a tool capable of processing large datasets and identifying patterns, its outputs are only as reliable as the data inputs and prompts used to generate them. The methodology does	To ensure soundness, the Council should publish: • The prompts and parameters used in the AI tool, • A list of sites identified by AI and how they were verified, • A statement on how AI outputs were reviewed and validated by officers.	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Critical of Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA), particularly its reliance on AI.	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		
								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			not disclose: • What specific prompts or parameters were used, • How the AI model was trained or validated, • What safeguards were in place to prevent errors or bias, • Whether the outputs were manually reviewed or verified. Without transparency over the inputs, assumptions, and decision rules, there is a risk that the AI may have misclassified sites, particularly where land use is ambiguous or where ownership constraints exist. This is a known limitation of AI systems, especially when applied to complex spatial and legal datasets. The absence of a clear audit trail or published outputs from the AI tool undermines confidence in the robustness of the site identification process. It also raises questions about whether the SLAA meets the requirements of paragraph 35 of 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					
								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				NPPF, which demands that plans be: • Justified – based on proportionate and transparent evidence; • Consistent with the requirements of national planning policy; • Effective – ensuring that sites are deliverable over the plan period; and • Positively prepared – to meet, as a minimum, objectively assessed development needs. To ensure soundness, the Council should publish: • The prompts and parameters used in the AI tool, • A list of sites identified by AI and how they were verified, • A statement on how AI outputs were reviewed and validated by officers. Until this is provided, the SLAA cannot be considered a fully transparent or proportionate basis for site selection. In the absence of this evidence, the sites selected for															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							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														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0947-0008	Agent	Liam	Ryder	Roscon	n Group c/o CODE Development Planners Ltd	Yes	SP3	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	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	From reviewing the evidence base prepared in support of the Castle Point Plan, CODE has substantial doubts regarding the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the number of homes shown for allocation within policy SP3 (Meeting Development Needs). In particular, there is a lack of transparency and certainty regarding presumed capacities of sites, and their deliverability. The evidence base is confusing and does not provide the required level of clarity to ensure transparency in the assumptions applied, and how these have been assessed by CPBC to translate into housing allocations. The Development Options Technical Paper (July 2024) outlines a draft urban capacity for the borough of 3,727 new homes (net capacity of new allocations of 2,204 homes, due to uncertainties over the likelihood		Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	From reviewing the evidence base prepared in support of the Castle Point Plan, CODE has substantial doubts regarding the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the number of homes shown for allocation within policy SP3 (Meeting Development Needs). In particular, there is a lack of transparency and certainty regarding presumed capacities of sites, and their deliverability. The evidence base is confusing and does not provide the required level of clarity to ensure transparency in the assumptions applied, and how these have been assessed by CPBC to translate into housing allocations. For CPBC to meet its objectively assessed housing needs over the plan period, it will have to consider the release of Green Belt sites to enable a sufficient number	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
								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				of residential development coming forward to replace existing business or services provided on sites + 1,523 dwellings of existing commitments). Capacities on proposed allocation sites (for the purposes of the development options technical paper) appear to have been calculated on the basis of percentage reductions based upon whether a site is currently accommodating community buildings and supermarkets (50% reduction in capacity), auto sites (25% reduction) and other uses such as industrial sites and garage sites. The presence of existing uses, including supermarkets which are unlikely to vacate existing premises, raises significant concerns over deliverability. However, the Housing Topic Paper (July 2025) details an additional exercise						of new market and affordable homes to be delivered in the borough over the course of the plan period. As highlighted within these representations, the record of affordable housing delivery in CPBC is abysmal. Unless and until CPBC recognises the land available within the borough to accommodate new housing (and which can support the provision of much needed infrastructure across the borough), there will continue to be a substantial shortfall in affordable housing provision. The local plan as drafted is not positively prepared, justified or effective for the provision of new homes over the course of the plan period.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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				The Density and Capacity Study then presents a range of dwellings which could be accommodated on each of the potential allocation sites. There is no clarity provided within the evidence base as to whether CPBC has selected the higher or lower number within the range, or a figure within the range, for the allocations, to achieve the overall number of dwellings to be allocated within the urban area of 4,868 homes. There can be no certainty or confidence in the ability of the Castle Point Plan to deliver the allocations which are included within the plan, over the course of the plan period. The simple nature of a significant number of the allocated sites benefitting from existing commercial and other uses, with no certainty over their intention to close their existing premises, cannot instil any confidence in the effectiveness of 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
							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 demonstra					local plan. The arbitrary reductions applied within the Development Options Topic Paper does not overcome the significant obstruction for delivery – the nature of many of the proposed allocation sites simply not being available or achievable for development. For CPBC to meet its objectively assessed housing needs over the plan period, it will have to consider the release of Green Belt sites to enable a sufficient number of new market and affordable homes to be delivered in the borough over the course of the plan period. As highlighted within these representations, the record of affordable housing delivery in CPBC is abysmal. CODE is mindful of the conclusions of the inspector for the appeal on land rear of 248 Hart Road, Thundersley, at paragraph 46: “The SoCG [Statement of Common Ground] also alludes 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		
								te 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				problems of delivery of affordable homes in the Borough. Moreover, the evidence before me demonstrates only 130 affordable homes were constructed between 2014 and 2022, but this does not include the 56 homes within existing stock transferred through Right to Buy over that period. The net figure of affordable homes built is therefore 74 or nine dwellings per annum, which equates to six percent of all homes built.” The inspector continued, at paragraph 47: “To add to this, data from DLUHC presented in the appellants’ report by Savills indicates affordable housing stock within Castle Point represents only a small proportion of the total stock (5.41 percent), which is significantly below the Essex average of 14.21 percent and 16.4 percent for England. The Council therefore has very limited existing affordable housing stock 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
								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				is falling significantly short of meeting its assessed need. Moreover, waiting times for 1-bed properties are 12-18 months, 18-24 months for 2-bed homes, and 30-36 months for a 3-bed house. As such, the outlook is very bleak for the significant number of households on the Housing Register, which has increased year-on-year, but is unlikely to capture all those in need of affordable housing, with the overall housing need likely being much greater. To add to this, the appellants’ evidence demonstrates there are considerable affordability problems with house prices and rent levels in the Borough, which are increasing.” Unless and until CPBC recognises the land available within the borough to accommodate new housing (and which can support the provision of much needed infrastructure across 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
							whether development needs that cannot be met wholly within a particular area could be met elsewhere. "					borough), there will continue to be a substantial shortfall in affordable housing provision. The local plan as drafted is not positively prepared, justified or effective for the provision of new homes over the course of the plan period.									
							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														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
											throughout the preparation of the Castle Point Plan and cannot be applied retrospectively.													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0947-0009	Agent	Liam	Ryder	Roscon Group c/o CODE Development Planners Ltd	Yes	SP3	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	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy		Sites like land east of Rayleigh Road, Thundersley have previously been identified as a suitable location for new housing in the borough by the very same local planning authority (and found sound further to examination) and which have been reviewed by statutory consultees who have offered no technical objections to the proposals (including from Essex County Council's highways team). Land east of Rayleigh Road is a site which can provide a significant number of new market and affordable homes (in comparison with the record of delivery in the borough since 2011). The site can come forward now to ensure that sufficient housing is provided to meet the genuine needs of local people. Land east of Rayleigh Road should therefore be considered for allocation to assist the Council in meeting its local housing needs. Whilst the site is	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	Argues that Site GB13 should have been allocated.	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
								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				within the Green Belt, it follows sustainable patterns of development and is located to the south of the Rayleigh Retail Park, which features a range of retail and hardware facilities, including a supermarket. The retail park also offers other employment opportunities in the form of light industrial offices, workshops and further retail space. The retail park is within a suitable walking distance from the appeal site. There are a number of important local facilities in Thundersley, Rayleigh and Hadleigh, including schools, leisure, retail and employment. These meet many of the day-to-day needs of existing local residents in Hadleigh, reducing the need to travel outside of the Borough. The site would therefore be consistent with the NPPF's drive to promote sustainable patterns of development and the site is 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. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 extent is constrained by these robust and enduring land uses and designations.A medium-high landscape sensitivity rating is given in the Landscape Sensitivity and Outline Appraisal (November 2024), this again considers the whole of Site GB13. It is to be noted that the Site is not subject to any landscape designation at the local or national level, nor are views from publicly accessible vantage points across the site protected in policy terms. It is therefore considered that with a sensitive design approach, one which relates to those areas readily influenced by the existing settlement edge, development of the site could come forward in a way that minimises landscape and visual harm to the site and local level and does not harm the Green Belt purposes when considering the plan area as a whole.									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0947-0010	Agent	Liam	Ryder	Roscon Group c/o CODE Development Planners Ltd	Yes	SP3	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	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The plan is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy for the reasons discussed in these representations. The plan does not provide for its full, objectively assessed needs (and the justification provided by CPBC in support of an alternative strategy is insufficient and not in accordance with national planning policy). The plan is not justified by its evidence base, which, inter alia, clearly finds several sites (including land east of Rayleigh Road, Thundersley – site GB13) as being capable of meeting the definition of Grey Belt (which, in accordance with national planning policy and assuming the golden rules outlined in paragraphs 156 and 157 are met) and therefore not representing inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As outlined within		Yes	Not Answered	Yes	A	The plan is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy for the reasons discussed in these representations. The plan does not provide for its full, objectively assessed needs (and the justification provided by CPBC in support of an alternative strategy is insufficient and not in accordance with national planning policy). The plan is not justified by its evidence base, which, inter alia, clearly finds several sites (including land east of Rayleigh Road, Thundersley – site GB13) as being capable of meeting the definition of Grey Belt (which, in accordance with national planning policy and assuming the golden rules outlined in paragraphs 156 and 157 are met) and therefore not representing inappropriate	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
								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				the NPPF (paragraph 146), exceptional circumstances for the review of Green Belt boundaries includes instances where a local planning authority cannot meet its identified need for homes. In those cases, the NPPF requires local planning authorities to review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in the Framework to propose alterations ot meet those needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt, when considered across the area of the plan. As outlined in the earlier sections of these representations, where it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give priority to previously developed land, then consider grey						development in the Green Belt. Concerns about approach to Green Belt, consistent with the NPPF. As outlined in the earlier sections of these representations, where it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give priority to previously developed land, then consider grey belt land which is not previously developed, and then other Green Belt locations. This exercise has plainly not been undertaken by CPBC.				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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				belt land which is not previously developed, and then other Green Belt locations. This exercise has plainly not been undertaken by CPBC. The Green Belt Assessment (July 2025) recommends that CPBC considers potentially altering the Green Belt boundary at 16 locations. The net change in Green Belt if all these potential alterations were implemented would be a 25.5ha reduction in Green Belt area (GB13 is included in the list of sites for further consideration). It should be noted that, in a borough which comprises 2,750ha of Green Belt land (as highlighted in paragraph 2.1.2 of the Green Belt Assessment (July 2025)), a release of 25.5ha of Green Belt land would represent just 0.927% of the total Green Belt land in CPBC. Evidently, the release of these sites, in order to meet objectively assessed housing needs, would 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
								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				undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole. Instead of considering the release of these sites, CPBC has concluded that Green Belt release would not be appropriate in the borough. The Sustainability Appraisal contains no such assessment, and, as flagged in these representations, does not transparently assess reasonable alternatives.. In addition, the Housing Topic Paper (July 2025) states, “The Council has exhaustively explored every reasonable alternative sources of land tested against the Green Belt Review, SFRA, LNRS, Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Site Accessibility and Suitability, Heritage Impact Assessments and the borough wide Transport Assessment. This rigorous process means the sites proposed for											

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
								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					allocation in the Plan represent the maximum amount of land that can be released for housing without causing unacceptable harm to flood safety, biodiversity, landscape character, heritage assets or the strategic road network. Releasing any further Green Belt land would breach one or more of those constraints and is therefore neither justified nor sound under the December 2024 NPPF.” However, such a conclusion is pre-emptive and does not consider the ability of sites to overcome constraints. Paragraph 110 of the NPPF is clear that development should be focussed on locations which are, or which can be made to be sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Land east of Rayleigh Road is evidently a sustainable location, in close proximity 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
								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				existing services and facilities. There is an opportunity to encourage new residents towards sustainable transport opportunities, including walking and cycling, with the benefit of key services and facilities within appropriate distances. This was accepted and encouraged by Essex County Council's Highways team in response to application 23/0085/OUT. To rectify the identified concerns regarding the soundness of the local plan and its evidence base, CPBC should consider opportunities to release Green Belt land (focussing first on grey belt sites such as GB13) to meet its objectively assessed housing needs in full. Failure to do so will likely lead to the local plan being found unsound at examination, with further subsequent delays to plan making in a borough with a chronic shortfall in 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	
												particularly for affordable housing for which the need is already acute. The plan’s focus on brownfield sites is not effective and will risk further worsening the acute shortfall in new housing across the borough, and in particular the existing lack of affordable housing (the affordable housing stock in the borough, in light of the right to buy, continues to decrease without a sufficient supply of new affordable homes being constructed locally. Finally, these representations identify several instances in which the Castle Point Plan has not been prepared in consistency with national planning policy and guidance. The plan is therefore unsound, and CPBC should consider reviewing the plan in advance of submission for examination to ensure the plan, as a minimum, seeks to meet its										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 undertake					objectively assessed housing needs and plans positively to invest in local infrastructure to support existing and future communities.									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
								n throughout the preparation of the Castle Point Plan and cannot be applied retrospectively. CODE therefore reserves the right to comment on the whether the duty to cooperate has been satisfied in further representations to the local plan examination, upon publication of further evidence.															
1007-0001	Individual	Paul	O’Leary		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Justified			No further building on Canvey until the road network is capable of sustaining the extra traffic that would be generated by this plan.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Transport capacity on Canvey Island	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 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		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
																			improved linkages to other areas. Growth in Castle Point will facilitate the delivery of the proposals in the Local Transport Plan 4.		
1008-0001	Individual	Monica	Pitts		Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and 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/greybelt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is based 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/greybelt sites added and the exclusion of north west Thundersley site. I do totally agree with Had 2 Policy for the Hadleigh Farm area which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural farming activities, nature conservation, SSS1, Ramsar site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt/brownfield site option for 7,500 homes, reduce the urban housing target to 3,500 from 6,200 with Canvey at 1,050 and Gsdkeigh 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 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,	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
														on this farmland site and hopefully SA 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								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 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 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

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

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1009-0001	Individual	Ron	Heyfron			Yes	SP3	No	The plan fails to meet targets imposed and this invites the central government of intercede	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.	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		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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once 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
														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.								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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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		
1010-0001	Individual	Alan	Hughes		Yes	SP3	No	I do not have the specific knowledge to comment	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	I do not consider that it meets the needs of the Area. The plan suggest the vast majority of new homes to be built on Canvey Island. Ever since I have lived here there have only been surveys that have stated how unprepared we are for the current population on Canvey, The roads are under stress from the increase in numbers and traffic evidenced by		No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Traffic Infrastructure Flooding on Canvey	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 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	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 poor road quality . The traffic flow increases every year therefore the traffic flow slows down every year , as witnessed by the traffic jams around and off the Island - such as Long Road and all school areas. Lack of parking areas or street parking again impedes traffic flow. The sewerage on Canvey is dire as the pipework is undersized and at breaking point. the pipework is 3 inches diameter and blocks frequently in certain areas especially Orange Road to name but one . I,m informed by an employee of Anglia Water. that the new developments do use 6 inch pipework but as soon as that pipework reaches the main sewer it has to join the 3 inch network and actually exacerbates the existing problem . Floods . On West Canvey when they created the new cemetery the water														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).	Flooding 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 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.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required								
														table was so high it was difficult to inter the coffins and installation of gravestones impossible. Constructing new industrial units there sounds good on paper but has a survey been carried out to assess the extra cost and increased insurance premiums to operate within this area. I understand why this area is appealing to build on but who is going to set up there. By building on Charfleets and Manor Trading estate where will the current employees find employment. Or are they just expected to claim benefits, increasing my council taxes. Law and Order We are currently being protected by cardboard policemen lurking inside shops. I have not seen actual policeman patrolling for years. This has enabled the creation of youth gangs to destroy buildings, painting walls, chop down trees and generally																		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												destroying their environment, this will only get worse . Since the last influx of people onto Canvey has resulted in people wandering around with apparently nothing to do.									
1011-0001	Individual	Laurel	Harding		Yes	SP3	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 the site selection ignores Greenbelt/Greybelt 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/Greybelt 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,	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Greybelt, 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 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	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
														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 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								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, 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 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	

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
1440-0012	Organisation	Joese ph	Beale	RSPB	Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Justified	Brownfield land needs to be clarified here and elsewhere in the Local Plan, to make it explicit that it is non-biodiverse brownfield land that will be targeted for development. Brownfield sites within Castle Point such as Canvey Wick SSSI and parts of the wider Thames Estuary North Important Invertebrate Area illustrate how	To slightly amend wording in this Policy, such as 3a and Paragraph 6.34, to clarify "non-biodiverse" brownfield land is the focus for development. Also to amend wording accordingly throughout the Local Plan document.	No				Brownfield land needs to be clarified here and elsewhere in the Local Plan, to make it explicit that it is non-biodiverse brownfield land that will be targeted for development. Brownfield sites within Castle Point such as Canvey Wick SSSI and parts of the wider Thames Estuary North Important	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
										biodiverse soem brownfield land can be, and Policy must be clear that such areas are not under threat of development, but rather only the species-poor brownfield sites. 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 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							Invertebrate Area illustrate how biodiverse soem brownfield land can be, and Policy must be clear that such areas are not under threat of development, but rather only the species-poor brownfield sites. 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 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				

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			
												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.' And in addition, 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).'						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.' And in addition, 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).'						

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0354-0001	Organisation	Mark	Sheppard	Southend City Council		SP3	Yes	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-	No	Not Stated		Southend-on-Sea City Council will be updating its Green Belt study to reflect the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 and will engage with you and with Rochford District Council as neighbouring Green Belt authorities in relation to the study methodology. As you will be aware, Southend-on-Sea City Council is currently consulting on its Local Plan – Preferred Approach with Options document at Regulation 18. This includes draft policies and potential site allocations. Evidence indicates that even if all the potential sites that have been promoted for development in Southend were to be carried forward as site allocations, Southend would be unable to meet its housing need in full using the Government's new Standard Method. This remains the case even if a sizeable windfall allowance could be demonstrated over the plan period.					A	An objection is raised in relation to 'soundness' of the Plan due to the failure to meet identified housing need, and importantly lack of robust evidence for this shortfall and justification for the dismissal of alternative spatial strategy options and previously considered Green Belt development sites that might have enabled the Borough to meet its housing need in full or 'closed the gap'. The not insignificant constraints in relation to flood risk and international and national biodiversity designations are also recognised. There is also a significant proportion of land designated as metropolitan green belt within the Borough. The submission Local Plan should set out clearly the rationale for the spatial strategy proposed, including the consideration and rejection of all sites being	Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. Within the NPPF Paragraph 11 section b (i) and (ii) give an acknowledgement of circumstances in which national policy does not expect Standard Method outcomes to be met in full. This includes situations where: • the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area 7 ; or • any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. Footnote 7 clarifies this position by providing a list of constraints. Green Belt is, prominently, among these,	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		
												Southend. The potential lower end of Southend unmet needs to 2040 (10,000 homes) includes all sites promoted to the local plan and a sizeable windfall allowance. This is not the case for CPBC Local Plan where a number of sites have been discounted in the Regulation 19 version of the plan. Given the significant sub-regional housing pressure and potential scale of unmet needs there should be strong and evidenced reasons as to why development is being restricted and potential development sites not included within the CPBC Local Plan. Ultimately, CPBC should be confident it is submitting a ‘sound’ plan where omission sites can be robustly justified at examination. Given the above, an objection is raised in relation to ‘soundness’ of the CPBC local plan due to the failure to meet identified housing need, and importantly lack of robust evidence for this											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								GB8 from the Green Belt. The omission of this site from the current consultation is therefore supported.																	
1024-0001	Individual	Alison	Millin		Yes	SP3	No	I do not believe that there has been sufficient engagement with areas in the vicinity of Castle Point to make agreements on infrastructure, agreements that would be beneficial to our borough. It does not provide sufficient housing supply to comply with	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with national policy	The plan does not provide evidence to explain why it believes that the government target cannot be met, in fact a huge shortfall in housing numbers. The blinkered approach of not building on greenbelt land, repeated ad nauseam, with no consideration of areas which may technically be described as greenbelt but in fact are scruffy and/or mixed use and semi-industrial, is not at all a sound approach. The glaring omission is the area in NW Thundersley. The	- increased use of brownfield sites - positive approach and fuller appraisal to NW Thundersley including proper co-operation with ECC. This is a key solution: incorporating existing green spaces whilst providing quality housing and infrastructure, thereby protecting true greenbelt against speculative development and resisting attempts to increase density on Canvey Island	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Not meeting housing targets infrastructure North West Thundersley Flooding on Canvey	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 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	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										
								targets set by government.			issue of access has been viewed as an insurmountable problem rather than efforts made to engage with ECC to find a solution. The online behaviour of some councillors in this respect has been unacceptable, with photographs of field but none of the industrial areas. Any comments highlighting the possibility of incorporating this area within the plan have been pounced on, often with residents being subject to ridicule and even bullying in late-night rants. This is not a positive preparation of a plan, far from it.								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.					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.				Flooding 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 management infrastructure is covered by policies SP4,

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
													flourish with additional housing at the levels proposed. A storm or high tide would easily cause the failure of drainage solutions.										SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the plan, and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to 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
1025-0001	Individual	Martin	England			Yes	SP3	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	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	Fails to consider strategic alternatives, like North West Thundersley. Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not identified the infrastructure required to meet the demands of new development in NW Thundersley. The Council have made no attempt to work positively with developers and landowners, neighbouring authorities, Essex County Council, and infrastructure providers throughout the planning process to consider the viability of NW Thundersley. The biodiversity and environmental protection needs strengthening. There is no credible five-year housing land supply, nor does it meet the housing target for Castle Point. Lack of evidence on cross-boundary infrastructure with a duty to cooperate. The policy of not building on the Greenbelt is biased and	<u>Duty to Cooperate</u> addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. <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 preferred. <u>Housing Numbers</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply</u> : See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply	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
										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, 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 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							predetermined.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. 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	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2. The Green Belt Assessment July 2025 reviewed all potential sites within Castle Point's Green Belt, these sites were then considered against further criteria including: environmental and heritage designations, flood risk, highways issues which impact viability, sustainability as well as having regard for the Essex LNRS and strategic opportunity areas for biodiversity improvements. Any potential grey belt sites identified within the Green Belt Assessment July 2025, were reviewed. However, none were considered suitable for development as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. <u>Highways Impacts</u> The plan has been subject 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
										councillors say it is not viable but they have not proposed any plan for this site for ECC to review and object to. 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							480, and Windfall Allowance 675. Total housing target of 11,000				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name		Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required					
														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																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 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										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required					
										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 benefits of preserving agricultural land applies regardless. Once the graded 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,																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required				
												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.															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1025-0003	Individual	Martin	England			Yes	SP3	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	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	Fails to consider strategic alternatives, like North West Thundersley. Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not identified the infrastructure required to meet the demands of new development in NW Thundersley. The Council have made no attempt to work positively with developers and landowners, neighbouring authorities, Essex County Council, and infrastructure providers throughout the planning process to consider the viability of NW Thundersley. The biodiversity and environmental protection needs strengthening. There is no credible five-year housing land supply, nor does it meet the housing target for Castle Point. Lack of evidence on cross-boundary infrastructure with a duty to cooperate. The policy of not building on the Greenbelt is biased and	<u>Duty to Cooperate</u> addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. <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 preferred. <u>Housing Numbers</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply</u> : See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply	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
										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. 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							predetermined.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. 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	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2. The Green Belt Assessment July 2025 reviewed all potential sites within Castle Point's Green Belt, these sites were then considered against further criteria including: environmental and heritage designations, flood risk, highways issues which impact viability, sustainability as well as having regard for the Essex LNRS and strategic opportunity areas for biodiversity improvements. Any potential grey belt sites identified within the Green Belt Assessment July 2025, were reviewed. However, none were considered suitable for development as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. <u>Highways Impacts</u> The plan has been subject 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
												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.					480, and Windfall Allowance 675. Total housing target of 11,000				
1025-0010	Individual	Martin	England		Yes	SP3	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	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	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	Fails to consider strategic alternatives, like North West Thundersley. Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not identified the infrastructure required to meet the demands of new development in NW Thundersley. The Council have made no attempt to work positively with developers and landowners, neighbouring authorities, Essex County Council, and infrastructure providers throughout the planning process to consider the viability of NW Thundersley	<u>Duty to Cooperate</u> addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. <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 preferred. <u>Housing Numbers</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic	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
										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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not identified the infrastructure required to meet the demands of new development in NW Thundersley. The Council have made no contributions towards the provision of infrastructure required to make a development proposal acceptable in planning terms for NW Thundersley. The Council have made no attempt to work positively with								form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. <u>Highways Impacts</u> The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
										developers and landowners, neighbouring authorities, Essex County Council and infrastructure providers throughout the planning process to consider the viability of NW Thundersley. The Council will also have regard to Essex County Council's (ECC) Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions. ECC play an important role as an infrastructure provider in Castle Point. The IDP fail to address the infrastructure needs to meet the growth within the Borough, with a development on the scale of NW Thundersley. ECC have had no plan to review over the NW Thundersley, and the council continue to categorically state that access from the A130 is not viable, and Essex County Council refuse to permit an access to the A130 but plans show a scheme was positively discussed by CPBC, ECC 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
												Basildon Council many years ago, but this has been ignored, see attached photo. This scheme shows what can be achieved with dialogue, the intention to progress positively and working in partnership. The ECC website states, in their Development Management Policy, all proposals are assessed and determined in relation to the Development Management Route Hierarchy Policies, where vehicular access is accepted in principle, the number of access points will be kept to a minimum and new access points will be designed and constructed in accordance with the current standards, where existing access is to be used substandard accesses will be improved and/or upgraded in accordance with the current standards for the category of road, and all proposals are assessed and determined against current standards									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												for the category of road having regard to the capacity, safety and geometry of the highway network. The NW Thundersley site should be added as an alternative, with 50% of the area on the call for sites and 50% of the area is grey belt factoring in PDL, but not one site has been added to the local plan.									
1026-0001	Individual	Lisa	Megenis		Yes	SP3	No	I don't know the legal side of this but it's not fair I don't see how that can be legal to be so obviously biased and just doing what a certain party wanted at the election rather than do what's right for people on Canvey and in Castle	No	Effective, Justified		Canvey is the worst place in Castle Point to build so many houses. Although I think we have to take our fair share, what the council has proposed is not fair at all. What justification is there for putting most of the houses on an island which has ONE traffic point where all 40 thousand of us have to go through rather than Castle Point where you have multiple real exits? Our one point is Waterside roundabout with two roads off for all of us what if there	Spread the houses out more fairly, so areas that have better infrastructure take more or even better, build new infrastructure instead of just making Canvey your dumping ground without any real improvements.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Doesn't want so many houses on canvey Flood risk on canvey Infrastructure	Comments noted 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 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	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
								Point as a whole.				is an emergency like a flood? We lost a school (old Castle View) on the island but now we're going to add thousands of extra people where are they supposed to go? Are there any council houses that are going to be built or will they all be expensive houses that local people can't afford? You should start again and do it FAIRLY so that everyone takes their fair share not just dump it all on Canvey!							relation to Canvey. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).		
0701-0001	Individual	Gavin	Robertson	STW FM Co Ltd	Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified		There is little within the Canvey Island allocation of dwellings that is Positively Prepared. Density of housing levels within Canvey Island are being expanded without consideration towards the infrastructure ie education, transportation, medical and citizen amenities. Moreover, to expand an island dwelling base where there are already severe strains on existing facilities is short sighted and unprofessional, this is NOT a “build	Re consider the option of North West Hadleigh site (known as the Blinking Owl site) for utilisation and Dwelling use of that brown field site rather than flatten the Charfleets industrial area within Canvey Island only to relocate that site elsewhere on Canvey.....in order to build those 3000 dwelling. This is almost a nonsensical decision unless you want to do things twice!	Not Answered	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 they will come” experiment. From an effective point of view....There is little consideration for quality and the word quantity seems to be the top of your agenda.There are suitable alternatives in order to achieve the housing plan targets elsewhere with Castle Point.....namely North West Hadleigh. From a justified stand point it makes little sense in overloading an already stretched Canvey, in order to house over 3000 homes when Canvey Island has already an expansion of over 150 homes a year by the Sandy Bay project....this was not mentioned in your proposals and indeed on discussion...your planning team knew nothing of this Sandy Bay number or development as it did not need their approval. This is why I am complaining to your loaded survey is ill conceived. poorly executed and lacking in justification.									

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
1027-0002	Agent	c/o agent	c/o agent	Taylor Wimpey	Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Positively prepared, Justified, Consistent with national policy		Policy SP3 states that the Castle Point Plan will deliver a minimum of 6,196 new homes over the period 2026-2043. In paragraph 6.52 of the draft Local Plan it is recognised that the current target for Castle Point, as established using the standard methodology set out in the revised NPPF of December 2024, is 686 new dwellings per annum. This equates to 11,662 over the Plan period. Paragraphs 61 and 62 of the NPPF state that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community. To determine the minimum number of homes needed,	The draft Plan is not Sound, as it is not 'positively prepared', it is not 'justified' and is not consistent with national policy. The draft Plan does not seek to deliver the minimum number of homes needed, based on the standard method, and could and should explore, at a much more granular level, options to meet the Government's standard method derived housing need.	Yes	Not Answered		A	Does not meet housing targets North West Thundersley	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 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. 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	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			
														strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning practice guidance. Paragraph 146 of the NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified through the preparation or updating of plans. Exceptional circumstances in this context include, but are not limited to, instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes through other means. If that is the case, authorities should review Green Belt boundaries in accordance with the policies in the Framework and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that doing so would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken													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						
														together) of the remaining Green Belt, when considered across the area of the plan. The draft Plan states that the evidence base has shown that achieving that target would significantly and irreversibly destroy large tracks of Green Belt, including land which strongly contributes to the Green Belt purposes, and undermine the approach to protecting and enhancing the natural environment set out in policy SP1, by impacting on protected areas and frustrating a landscape scale approach to green infrastructure and nature recovery. Furthermore, transport modelling has shown that the road network in Castle Point operates at capacity already, and the impacts of growth would be severe. There are also constraints related to health service provision. Demand on health																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required						
														services in South East Essex have grown but this has not been aligned with sufficient revenue funding to meet needs. Consequently, whilst this Plan could reasonably secure new health facilities, the local health services are unable to resource such facilities with staff. However, the 2025 Green Belt Review does not consider all land parcels in the Borough and there are significant areas that were not assessed. The 2018 Review considered wider parcels that did cover the Borough, but one large area (central corridor) was totally ruled out because: “These parcels of Green Belt serve to restrict the settlements of South Benfleet and Thundersley from merging and also create a connection between the northern Green Belt parcels within the borough to those in the south. Without this linkage, the demarcation 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							
														these two urban areas would be indistinct and the wider Green Belt of Castle Point would become additionally fragmented. At a sub-regional level this corridor is particularly important as it plays a role in linking the strip of Green Belt running along the Thames Estuary to the Green Belt extending between Rayleigh and Wickford and across towards Basildon” These were large areas and no further detailed analysis was undertaken on smaller parcels within these areas – for example the Central Corridor which varies significantly in land area between the north, the south and the middle. The 2025 Green Belt Assessment assessed smaller parcels, but this was selective and did not comprehensively cover the whole Borough. There is limited or no valid justification as to why only a few																	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 sub-areas were selected. The Green Belt Review 2025 is flawed, as it should comprehensively review all Green Belt land. For example, the 2025 Assessment states that the Council previously identified an area of 160ha GB16 (North West of Thundersley) as a potential Green Belt site option and this was assessed at a parcel level (as parcel 1) in the 2018 Green Belt Review. Paragraph 5.1.2 of the 2025 assessment states: ‘Parcel 1 possesses a complicated fabric with fragmented land ownership and a varied planning history and contexts relating to individual sites. It is therefore deemed to be inappropriate to assess this as a sub-area within our assessment and instead sub-areas have been assessed at a more appropriate level of granularity’ (para 5.1.2). However, this is not appropriate											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required										
														reason to exclude large areas of the land from the GB review, given that the site was considered by the Council as a potential option to meet the housing requirement and that the Council should be appropriately assessing all options. To add to this point, it should be noted that within in Parcel 1 there is much land that has been identified as being ‘potential grey belt’, as set out in Figure 18 of the 2025 assessment. This would be a further reason for giving careful consideration to potential new development in that Parcel to meet identified needs. On the other concerns raised by the Council regarding this larger area, it is evident that the Council has failed to consider the scope for mitigation of these impacts. In the context of the above and by																				

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						
												way of an example of how the current draft Local Plan has not fully assessed all options - the Issues and Options Consultation Document of July 2024 identified Option 3 for accommodating the growth needs of the Borough. This Option was to release significant areas of Green Belt to meet the standard method need and this included land at north west Thundersley. It is noted on page 52 of the Consultation document that “Land would be identified following a Green Belt review, and any substantial Green Belt sites would include proportionate employment, infrastructure, and services to balance the increase in new homes”. The ‘pros’ of this option are listed as: - Local housing need is exceeded, producing extra choice in the local housing market. - Relatively high infrastructure contributions. - This level 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				
										growth will generate surplus labour, which may have positive consequences for the local economy. These would, therefore, address the concerns raised above, but the Council has chosen not to explore such an option. The ‘cons’ include: significant environmental impacts arising from the development of greenfield land; and increased population ‘may’ increase out commuting and associated congestion on local roads and the strategic road network. However, there was no evidence produced showing significant environmental impacts on designated sites (there are very few) and no evidence of out commuting is provided. The draft Plan is not Sound, as it is not ‘positively prepared’, it is not ‘justified’ and is not consistent with national policy. The draft Plan does not seek															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 deliver the minimum number of homes needed, based on the standard method, and could and should explore, at a much more granular level, options to meet the Government's standard method derived housing need.									
1028-0001	Individual	Jade and Michael	Pittman		Yes	SP3	No		No	Effective, Justified	It's not 'appropriate' to build that much on Canvey without a third road. The infrastructure can't cope and from what I've seen of the plan they aren't going to meaningfully ensure that it's improved. How can you take away business areas and not sensibly plan for the future of employment on Canvey that will just force more	See previous answer.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Concerned regarding the amount of homes planned for Canvey Island Concerned regarding the loss of employment space Infrastructure	Comments noted The plan does not reduce the amount of employment space and plans for employment growth on Canvey Island 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
														people off the Island and cause more carnage at Sadler's farm roundabout which affects all of us in Benfleet as well. The numbers for Benfleet, Thundersley, etc. seem a lot more reasonable, and you should have the same approach for Canvey as well. I want to protect the green belt but I also want a fair plan that reflects the needs of the area more. If you can't get the numbers down more, you should see if neighbouring areas are willing to take on some of our numbers, and if you can't then you should look at building in a way where the new builds don't have loads of cars and instead have good public transport options.											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1034-0001	Individual	Sharon	O'Donoghue			Yes	SP3	No	Didn't contemplate other possibilities eg North West Thundersley. No convincing five year housing land provision.	No	Consistent with national policy		It fails to achieve housing targets, contrary to national guidelines with erroneous site selection application, It is not consistent with national policy. It doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and the site selection ignores Green belt /Grey belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Green belt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Green belt or Grey belt sites added and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site. I 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,	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha as a Green belt , 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	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
										Sea. I can support this Had2 Policy with no housing development on this farmland site. 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.								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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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		
1037-0001	Individual	Michelle	Chambers		Yes	SP3	No	Oak tree felling is an offence. The infrastructure won't take any more building of houses. Don't take away our green belt areas.	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	The tree roots will cause a detrimental affect to building with subsidence. The drainage system in the area can't take the strain. It is not justified to destroy natural creature habitats	Scrap the plans to build houses	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered		No building in the green belt felling oak trees is illegal Tree roots will cause subsidence strain on drainage system no more houses	Comments noted The plan does not plan for the removal of oak trees Any development proposed would be	N		
1038-0001	Individual	Emma	Cenizo-Shamshoum		Yes	SP3	Yes		Yes	Effective	As long as brown belt is being reused, not greenbelt.	Our are cannot take a large increase in housing, people or traffic due to lack of infrastructure:	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant, as long as no green belt is used. Has some worries	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
												schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals, and the traffic is horrendous already creating pollution in our environment. We also already have a lot of flooding, due to too much housing.					around impacts of too large a housing growth.				
1039-0001	Individual	Duncan	Gotobed		Yes	SP3	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 fails to meet the tests of soundness on both justification and consistency with national policy. Inconsistency with National Policy: The plan does not align with national policy requirements and fails to meet Castle Point's housing targets. The site selection process disregards Green Belt and Grey Belt considerations, contrary to updated NPPF guidelines that require proper assessment of these designations. Lack of Justification: The site selection strategy demonstrates predetermined bias toward a "no Green Belt build" policy without adequate justification. The approach relies excessively on overdeveloping	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.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting housing targets Five year housing land supply North west thundersley Green/Grey Belt Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency evacuation	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 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	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					
										brownfield sites rather than conducting a comprehensive assessment of all available options. Notably, Green Belt and Grey Belt sites have been systematically excluded from consideration, including North West Thundersley. Flood Risk and Drainage Concerns: The plan contradicts NPPF guidelines requiring development to be directed away from areas of highest flood risk. The proposed SUDS measures are inappropriate for Canvey Island's unique geographical conditions and existing drainage infrastructure, potentially exacerbating flood risks. Community Impact and Safety: The allocation of 3,316 urban homes for Canvey Island lacks adequate community consultation and resident input. Furthermore, the proposed Canvey West development compromises														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 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 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							

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
												emergency evacuation procedures, placing existing residents in the eastern areas at increased risk during emergency situations.										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 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1042-0001	Individual	Andrea	Gotobed			Yes	SP3	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 sound because it doesn't follow national policy and isn't properly justified. Not Following National Policy: The plan doesn't meet national policy rules and fails to hit Castle Point's housing targets. The way they've chosen sites ignores Green Belt and Grey Belt land, which goes against the updated national planning guidelines that say these areas must be properly considered. Poor Justification: The site selection is biased - they've already decided not to build on Green Belt land without giving good reasons why. They're trying to cram too many houses onto brownfield sites instead of looking at all the options available. They've deliberately ignored Green Belt and Grey Belt sites, e.g. for North West Thundersley. Flood Risk Problems: The plan goes	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	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting housing targets Five year housing land supply North west thundersley Green/Grey Belt Flood Risk on Canvey Emergency evacuation	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once 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
										against national guidelines that say new housing should be kept away from flood risk areas. The drainage solutions they're proposing won't work properly on Canvey Island because of our unique geography and existing drainage problems, which could make flooding worse. Impact on Residents: The 3,316 new homes planned for Canvey Island haven't been properly discussed with local residents. The Canvey West development will make it harder for people living in the east of the island to evacuate safely in an emergency, putting them at greater risk.										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 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 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	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 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. Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1050-0001	Individual	Lina	Makneviciute			Yes	SP3	No	The Castle point plan does not provide the number of housing required by the Government. It only accounts for half of required housing and therefore will most definitely be found unsound by the government. It does not demonstrate that all options have been considered. This makes the plan vulnerable and gives developers a chance to submit Green belt applications.	No	Consistent with national policy	As mentioned above, this plan did not consider all viable options. North West Thundersley site could provide a large number of required housing and could make the numbers in the local plan I know that a road to NW Thundersley is possible and it is definitely the best site in terms of causing minimal impact on existing road and traffic conditions and other infrastructure such as medical centres and school as there would be an opportunity to build those there.	The plan needs to include the full number of houses required by government targets. The additional housing needs to go to the NW Thundersley site. If the plan is submitted in its current form it will definitely be deemed unsound. The plan needs to clearly prove that all grey belt options have been considered, and why any considered sites are not suitable. NW Thundersley site is most definitely suitable and it should be placed into the local plan.	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Does not meet housing targets North West Thundersley	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 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. 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	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
																			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.		
1052-0001	Individual	Carey	Cooper		Yes	SP3	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 development	Add North West Thundersley site, 187Ha, 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.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West thundersley No five year housing land supplyDoesn't meet housing targetsGreen/Grey BeltCanvey floodriskEmergency Evacuation	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 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	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
																					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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1053-0001	Individual	Heleen	Scarlett			Yes	SP3	Yes	Building on greenbelt land is awful. We need grass and trees. We have not got the infrastructure to support more	No	Effective, Justified		This isn't nonsense about wording. Stop allowing developers to make a fortune at the expense of existing residents.	Not Answered	Not Answered	Not Answered		No building on greenbelt land Infrastructure	The Castle Point Plan does not allocate any development on Green Belt Plan 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
								homes - roads, doctors etc.																	
1058-0001	Individual	John	Champion		Yes	SP3	No	Like most residents, (& even Councillors !), I am not legal expert on Planning Laws. However, my understanding from National Government comments and media, it appears a legal requirement to try and meet Housing targets under NPPF. The Plan only meets just over 50% of target and I feel that Inspector/ Whitehall or Ministry will look no further in assessing it.	No	Effective, Consistent with national policy	Only meets c.50% of National targets for housing needs under NPPF, although that figure is totally unrealistic. See 2b above. The current rate of building new property is far below the rate proposed in the Plan already, and the increase to NPPF rate is simply unrealistic. Apart from land availability, there are not resources including labour) available to achieve it. There is a heavy proportion of the proposed housing need placed on Canvey Island. Given the current issues with access to/from the Island, as well as flood risk, this does not seem appropriate. The planned building is heavily back loaded into years 11-17.		A robust explanation specifically detailing why the NPPF target should be significantly reduced. I support the principle of prioritising development in urban areas / brownfield sites and retaining as much existing green belt areas as possible, although some of these have already been lost in absence of a plan eg Land north of The Chase. Owners in the area may disagree, but I think there should be detailed study of potential development of area known as NW Thundersley / Blinking Owl. There are already some buildings there and it provides opportunity for access to major trunk roads in District without impacting already gridlocked towns and villages. I consider this has potential to meet	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Not meeting housing target North West Thundersley Support the councils urban first approach Objects to removal of car parks in hadleigh Questions local bus rerouting/frequency	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 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. 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.	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
								unrealistic. Castle Point is not only short on own infrastructure (Roads, Health in particular) but sits on the 2 major exits routes from City of Southend (A13/A127) to the East. Their development targets, even in a reduced form are unsustainable in additional transport volumes that would pass through Castle Point on road and rail.					significant part of housing target and leave existing Green Belt untouched and reduce reliance on Canvey Island.						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 support the Council view of concentrating on 'urban development' and retention of Green Belt sites, in particular, Salvation												Support to the urban first approach noted.		
																				Objection to the removal of public car parks noted		
																				Decisions regarding ammendments to bus routes/frequency are a matter for 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. 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
								re-instatement of previous route 21 through Thundersley village would help many, particularly with access to Southend Hospital. However, it cannot be ignored that the frequency on these routes has been reduced and routes curtailed by First Bus. It would seem unlikely that they will reinstate and increase them!														
1060-0001	Individual	Dean	Collins		Yes	SP3	No	I think it fails to consider some basic Human Rights principles set out in the ECHR.	No	Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	1/Its not been resident led and has very much been played out on facebook rather than advertised to the wider community. 2/Far too much burden put on canvey island and anyone who feels that canvey was able to take more		I don't believe even a third road could elevate the problems that these extra properties would bring. The slightest little issue now and Canvey becomes gridlocked If this plan goes through those who have engineered it	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Fails to consider human rights in accordance with the ECHR lack of public consultation Too many homes on Canvey due to traffic	The local Plan respects the convention rights and part of examination will confirm if it is legally compliant which includes compliance with the Human Rights Act. Public Consultation The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22	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
											traffic needs to be put in a straight jacket and taken to a sanatorium. 3/The plan has very much been weighted in favour of the larger party who have protected their own wards	at some point will undoubtedly have blood on their hands							consultation statement. 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 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. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1065-0001	Individual	Terry	Clarke			Yes	SP3	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	Add North West Thundersley site, reduce the urban housing target by half,	No	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	North West Thundersley No five year housing land supply Doesn't meet housing target Green/Grey Belt	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
										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.								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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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
1066-0001	Individual	Sheila	Clarke		Yes	SP3	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	Add North West Thundersley site, reduce the urban housing target by half,	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		North West Thundersley No five year housing land supply Doesn't meet housing target Green/Grey Belt	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
										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.								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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 site for those reasons set out above.		
1071-0001	Individual	paul	smith		Yes	SP3	No	draft local plan is unsound due to only accounting for half of the housing required by the government. It needs to add the full amount of required housing and add the NW Thundersley	No	Consistent with national policy	draft local plan is unsound due to only accounting for half of the housing required by the government. It needs to add the full amount of required housing and add the NW Thundersley site for this additional housing.	draft local plan is unsound due to only accounting for half of the housing required by the government. It needs to add the full amount of required housing and add the NW Thundersley site for this additional housing.	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Not meeting the housing target North West Thundersley	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	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. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								y site for this additional housing.												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. 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1072-0001	Individual	Harry	England			Yes	SP3	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	Add North West Thundersley site, reduce the urban housing target by half.	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 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, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a	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
										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.								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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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
1081-0001	Individual	Daniel	Sullivan			Yes	SP3	No		Positively prepared, Effective, Justified	Objection to Proposed Housing Development on Canvey Island I am writing to formally object to the proposed housing developments on Canvey Island as part of the Castle Point Local Plan. While I understand the need for housing nationally, I believe this proposal is deeply unsuitable for Canvey Island for the following reasons: 1. Unsustainable Infrastructure and Access Canvey Island has only two access roads, both of which are frequently congested. During peak hours, weekends, or in the event of an accident, the island becomes gridlocked. The Waterside Farm roundabout is a known choke point, and additional housing will only increase traffic volumes, making daily life more difficult and potentially dangerous in emergencies. 2. Overpopulation and Pressure on			No	Not Answered	Yes			Lack of inclusivity on the consultation Traffic concerns Flood risk on canvey Lack of opportunities for over 16 education Lack of investment in people	Consultation 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. 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 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. 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	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. Lack of Opportunity and Educational Provision Canvey Island already suffers from limited access to further and higher education. There are no colleges or universities on the island, and the only local post-16 provision is limited in scope. Young people must travel off-island to access a broader range of courses, which is a barrier—especially for those from lower-income families. Castle Point ranks poorly in national opportunity indices, and Canvey Island in particular has lower educational attainment and life expectancy than the mainland. Building more homes without investing in education, skills, and opportunity will only deepen existing inequalities. 6. No Investment in People This plan focuses on physical development without addressing the needs of 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			
												population. There is no parallel investment in education, transport, or economic opportunity. We risk creating a larger population with fewer prospects, worsening outcomes for current and future residents. Conclusion Canvey Island is not a suitable location for large-scale housing development. The island's infrastructure, geography, and socio-economic challenges make this proposal unsustainable and potentially harmful. I urge the council to reconsider and instead focus on improving opportunity, education, and quality of life for existing residents before expanding the population further.												
1084-0001	Individual	Sue	Tomlin		Yes	SP3	No	The infrastructure cannot cope with the number of houses already in the area. The	No	Consistent with national policy	The plans are a tick box exercise to comply with government targets with no thought of improving the infrastructure to support it	The people of Castle Point deserve better our infrastructure cannot cope as it is. The environmental costs outweigh any out of touch government target	No	Not Answered	Not Answered		Infrastructure concerns Traffic Concerns	Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Transport The plan has been subject 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. 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
								schools , doctors are at capacity. The roads cannot cope with the additional traffic													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 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.			
1096-0001	Individual	Gary	Langlois		Yes	SP3	No	There is no provision for the infrastructure on the island for all the vehicles that theses developments will bring. Clearly there has been no thought put into the plan at all. There is no room for anymore homes this end of the country period!	No	Justified	Infrastructure!		Scrap the whole idea, NO MORE BUILDING! Including a third exit off!	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered			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
1103-0001	Not Answered	Victoria	Sullivan		Not Answered	SP3	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.	No	Positively prepared	Objections to the Proposed Housing Development in Castle Point – Focus on Canvey Island Part 1: Main Objections 1. Severe Access and Traffic Issues Canvey Island already suffers from significant traffic congestion, particularly during rush hours and weekends. The island becomes gridlocked when incidents occur on or near the main access routes. The Waterside Farm roundabout is a known bottleneck, and additional housing will inevitably increase the number of vehicles, worsening an already overburdened road network. 2. Overpopulation and Density Castle Point is already one of the most densely populated areas in England. According to your own consultation report, in 2021 there were 14.3 people per football pitch-sized piece of land, up from 14.1 in 2011. This places the borough in the top 30% of		No	Not Answered				Transport Development is too dense Infrastructure Flood risk on Canvey Further education on Canvey	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 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. Dense Development The council has taken an urban first approach to development which is aligned with national planning policy. Densities prescribed are based on the density and capacity study which is available to view on the website. Infrastructure Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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	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
								consultation is sound or legally compliant?				the most densely populated local authorities in the country. Adding more housing will only intensify this pressure. 3. Strain on Public Services Each new home is likely to house multiple residents, increasing demand on schools, healthcare, social care, and other essential services. However, Castle Point Borough Council does not commission or control these services, meaning there is no guarantee that the necessary infrastructure will be provided to support population growth. 4. Flood Risk Some of the proposed housing is planned on flood-prone land. Canvey Island has experienced flooding in the past decade due to inadequate infrastructure, and its history includes the devastating floods of the 1950s. Building on flood plains is irresponsible and puts future residents at risk.									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. Further education on Canvey Policy INFRA2 seeks to safeguard and encourage further education	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required									
														Part 2: Education and Opportunity 1. Low Opportunity and Social Mobility Castle Point ranks 390 out of 533 in the Sutton Trust Opportunity Index, which measures access to opportunity based on education, employment, and socio-economic background. This reflects a serious lack of access to high-quality jobs, education, and skills training—particularly on Canvey Island. 2. Lack of Local Employment Opportunities There are few high-quality jobs with progression opportunities in Castle Point. The consultation report notes that 98% of local businesses are micro or small enterprises, which typically lack the capacity to offer apprenticeships or career development. This forces residents to commute off-island, further straining the limited transport infrastructure. 3. Transport as a Barrier to Opportunity																			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required				
											Canvey Island's geography and limited transport links restrict access to education and employment. Research from Parliament and the Local Government Association shows that poor transport infrastructure significantly limits economic inclusion. Young people from lower-income backgrounds are particularly affected, as the cost and complexity of travel can prevent them from pursuing further education or training. 4. Inadequate Further and Adult Education Provision There are no further education institutions on Canvey Island. The Xtend campus offers limited higher education options, primarily in early years education, which lacks diversity and does not meet the needs of all young people—particularly boys or those interested in trades or academic pathways. While																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										some provision exists in Benfleet (USP College, King John, Appleton), travel remains a barrier. Adult education is also severely lacking. Castle Point has no responsibility for education, which falls under Essex County Council. This disconnect means that planning for new housing does not automatically include planning for the educational needs of the population. 5. Educational Underperformance Only 20% of students in Canvey Island’s secondary schools achieved a grade 5 or above in English and Maths last year. Progress 8 scores—used to measure student progress—are significantly below the national average. This indicates that young people are not receiving the quality of education needed to succeed, perpetuating cycles of disadvantage and inequality.											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												6. Health and Socioeconomic Inequality While overall life expectancy in Castle Point is in line with national averages, there are stark disparities between Canvey Island and the mainland. In 2022–23, 20.5% of under-16s in Canvey lived in relative low-income families. These inequalities are compounded by poor educational outcomes and limited access to opportunity. Conclusion While infrastructure concerns are often raised in response to housing developments, the issues facing Canvey Island go far deeper. The proposed developments risk worsening existing inequalities and placing unsustainable pressure on services that the borough does not control. There is investment in housing, but no parallel investment in the people who live here.									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 are creating a perfect storm: more people, fewer opportunities, and no clear plan to address the underlying issues. Canvey Island residents deserve better. They deserve access to good jobs, quality education, and a future they can aspire to. Building more houses without addressing these fundamental challenges will only deepen the divide.											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1104-0001	Individual	Darren	Thipthorpe			SP3	No	The Regulation 19 consultation represents a vital opportunity to shape a Local Plan that reflects not only the needs of our communities but also their values and aspirations . Castle Point is a unique and tightly constrained area. We are blessed with beautiful open spaces, a rich natural environment, and a strong sense of local identity. But we also face serious challenges, particularly around flood risk, infrastructure capacity, and the pressure to accommod	No			Soundness of the Plan To be found sound at examination, the Castle Point Local Plan must satisfy the four statutory tests of soundness as defined in paragraph 35 of the NPPF. These are, positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy. While I acknowledge the considerable work undertaken by Castle Point Borough Council, I remain concerned that the Plan does not yet meet these essential criteria in full. There is absolutely no doubt that the housing target for Castle Point imposed centrally by the Government is impossible to meet. It would in fact be impossible for our Borough to cope with a number of houses anywhere near that target without losing its character and causing critical failure of the local infrastructure residents rely on every day. However, in order to successfully argue its case for a lower housing	Conclusion and Recommendation to Modify the Plan The Castle Point Plan is a defining document for our Borough. The Council should be commended for prioritising brownfield sites and engaging positively with residents throughout the Regulation 19 process. However, I believe the Plan requires significant revision to meet the tests of soundness. Castle Point has significant infrastructure vulnerabilities, particularly in Canvey Island. The allocation of over 3,300 homes on the island must be reconsidered. The Plan falls short in demonstrating a deliverable five-year housing land supply. Strengthening the brownfield strategy and including North West Thundersley would improve resilience and deliverability. Essex County Council is investing in infrastructure and would be legally obliged to					Flood risk Infrastructure capacity Flood risk on canvey Highway infrastructure Supports protection of the greenbelt North west thundersley Lack of five year housing land supply Lack of duty to cooperate Evidence for not meeting housing numbers	Flood risk The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides an overview of flood risk within Castle Point and then provides site specific information for the allocations in the Castle Point Plan and provides recommendations on how to address any flood risk arising through development. Infrastructure capacity Infrastructure matters (including healthcare and education) are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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. Highway infrastructure The plan has been subject to detailed Transport	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	
								ate growth. These issues are especially acute on Canvey Island, where the risks of tidal and surface water flooding are well known. Also, significantly there are effectively only three highways access routes in and out of the Borough for all its almost 100K residents, Sadlers Farm, the A13 towards Southend, or Rayleigh Weir. I welcome the Council's decision not to include any of the Green Belt sites that are so treasured by local residents in the first				figure, the Council has to produce the strongest possible evidence that it cannot meet the Government's target and needs to show it has considered every viable alternative. I think significant work is still required from the Council to meet both these vital requirements, to successfully secure the acceptance of a significantly lower housing figure than the proposed target. The Plan proposes to deliver only around 53% of the Government's housing target, representing a shortfall of approximately 5,446 homes over the 17-year plan period. This gap has not been robustly justified. Although to many residents and observers it is obvious that our area cannot meet the Government's impossibly high housing target, the strongest possible evidence must be presented to explain and prove exactly why. Environmental constraints and infrastructure	cooperate. North West Thundersley offers a strategic opportunity for sustainable growth.						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 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.	Supports protection of the greenbelt 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.	Lack of five year housing land supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								Thundersley, or colloquially as the expanded ‘Blinking Owl Site’. This site offers a rare opportunity to deliver much-needed housing in a sustainable and accessible location, without undermining the wider function of the Green Belt. It is a pragmatic solution to a difficult problem, and I support its inclusion in the Plan as a way to increase the soundness of the plan whilst allowing for the better protection of other more accessible Green Belt sites residents treasure, a significant				highest risk of Flooding. The current strategy does not reflect this principle even though flood risk on Canvey is subject to very effective mitigation, the unique adaptations to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) necessary to not upset the balance of the island’s already complex drainage network are not sufficiently taken into account in the Plan. Many of the SUDS’ measures routinely deployed on housing sites elsewhere in the country are simply not appropriate for Canvey Island’s unique geography and drainage infrastructure. The island’s low elevation, high groundwater levels, tidal influence and reliance on pumped discharge mean that infiltration-based systems such as soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable paving that depends on infiltration, and unlined attenuation basins would be ineffective at best –							ensure that the Duty to Cooperate has been met. Evidence for not meeting housing numbers 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. While the Plan does not meet the standard method housing requirement, this does not automatically mean that it is not sound. A sound plan must be based on a robust and credible evidence base and reflect the realities and constraints of the area. The proposed housing figure is justified by robust evidence which the Council will set out during the examination.			

[illegible]

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								given its environmental, Tidal Flood Risk, Hazardous Industries and infrastructure constraints . * The Council's removal of several Green Belt sites is commendable and reflects strong community engagement. t. * North West Thundersley offers a sustainable and strategic location for growth and should be included in the Plan to better protect Green Belt sites and enable a considerable decrease in proposed housing numbers on Canvey Island. * The plan lacks a demonstrable five-				residents. Its exclusion is not adequately justified in the Council's evidence base. The Sustainability Appraisal fails to assess North West Thundersley as a reasonable alternative. This omission risks rendering the Plan unsound under paragraph 35(b) of the NPPF. A revised spatial strategy should reduce the housing burden on Canvey Island and incorporate North West Thundersley. Canvey Island's geography and infrastructure present significant planning challenges, particularly related to flood risk. I welcome the Council's commitment to requiring Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) in all new developments. However, SUDS must be designed with a full understanding of Canvey's unique drainage context. The slow release of retained water can have negative cumulative effects if not properly accounted for.											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 lack of a third access point to Canvey because of its unique geography remains a strategic weakness. The housing allocation to Canvey Island should be reduced and made contingent upon robust flood resilience measures, including a comprehensive drainage strategy unique to Canvey Island and renewed exploration of a third access route. The reliance on inadequate traffic routes to the Proposed Canvey West development, Haven Road, Northwick Road and Roscommon Way, all 3 filtering out onto Canvey Road at the Dutch Village area will lead to increased and unacceptable congestion and pollution. North West Thundersley offers a more suitable alternative, with better connectivity, lower flood risk, and infrastructure-led potential. Five-year Housing Supply and Green Belt Protection Castle Point Borough Council									

[illegible]

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												residential settlements in the Borough. Recommendation to include North West Thundersley in the plan as a strategic housing growth site. The exclusion of North West Thundersley from the Castle Point Plan is not only a strategic oversight, it is a missed opportunity to deliver sustainable, infrastructure-led growth in a location that is demonstrably more suitable than many of the sites currently proposed. The area, particularly the Blinking Owl site, has long been recognised in previous capacity studies as capable of accommodating up to and over 5,000 homes. This scale of development would not only relieve pressure on Canvey Island but also contribute meaningfully to closing the gap between Castle Point's current housing trajectory and the Government Assessed Need. The current Plan places									

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					
													disproportionate reliance on Canvey Island, despite its well-documented flood risks and infrastructure constraints. By contrast, as previously discussed, North West Thundersley offers a strategic growth location with lower flood risk, stronger transport connectivity, and greater public support. It is situated on higher ground, adjacent to the A127 corridor. These characteristics align with the principles set out in paragraphs 8, 11, and 20 of the NPPF (2024), which require that development be directed to locations that are sustainable, resilient and capable of supporting necessary infrastructure. Claims that the North West Thundersley site is not viable due to policy restrictions by the local highways authority are unjustified in the plan and do not withstand scrutiny. Essex County Council is currently																	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
														investing over £59 million in the Fairglens Interchange upgrade, in partnership with the Department for Transport and the South East Local Enterprise Partnership. This scheme includes new slip roads, signalised junctions, and pedestrian/cycle infrastructure, all designed to accommodate future housing and economic growth in South Essex. Additionally, Essex County Council's own infrastructure planning documents acknowledge that the A127/A130 corridor will come under increasing pressure due to planned growth, and that long-term options for further expansion remain viable, subject to funding and strategic coordination. There is no formal policy from Essex County Council opposing new junctions in principle. On the contrary, their planning approach is growth-responsive and designed to 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	
											development where it is justified and properly planned. It is also important to clarify that, under the Duty to Cooperate provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and as reinforced by paragraphs 24–28 of the NPPF, Essex County Council would be legally obliged to engage with Castle Point Borough Council if North West Thundersley were included in the Plan. Their role would be to assess feasibility, cost and mitigation – not to veto strategic growth proposals. The Planning Inspectorate has consistently advised that infrastructure constraints must be addressed through joint working and evidence-based planning, not through informal objections. Furthermore, while a portion of the site lies within the Green Belt designation, its inclusion can be justified under paragraph 143 of the NPPF, which allows for Green													

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	
												Belt release where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated. In this case, the circumstances are clear: Castle Point faces a significant housing shortfall, and North West Thundersley offers a location where growth can be delivered safely, sustainably, and with minimal environmental impact. The site is composed largely of ‘Grey Belt’ plotlands, light industrial units, and inaccessible land, and its development would affect fewer existing residents than other Green Belt sites. It is precisely the kind of strategic release that the NPPF envisages – one that protects more sensitive areas by concentrating growth where it can be properly supported. In summary, the Plan should be modified to include North West Thundersley as a strategic growth location. This would not only improve the Plan’s soundness under paragraph 35, but also reflect a more balanced,										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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-led, and community-supported approach to development across Castle Point. It is a solution that meets the tests of sustainability, deliverability, and public interest — and one that should be embraced, not dismissed. As a Resident of Castle Point, I find the format of the CPBC Plan Regulation 19 makes it difficult for me to engage with, therefore I trust that my use of this format will not make it impossible for my views to be accepted. Previously the original Local Plan 2011, was rejected by the Examining Inspector, due to reliance of Land on Canvey Island so as to protect the Mainland’s Green Belt. The Inspector found that approach totally unacceptable due to the Flood Risk issue. This latest version of the Plan, some 14 years later, indicates Castle Point Borough Council relying on land in a Flood Risk zone3 at Canvey Island 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
												content to make the same mistakes of old! With the right adjustments, this Plan can secure a future for our local area that is sustainable and in the best interests of current and future residents of our Borough. I strongly urge Castle Point Borough Council to modify the Plan before submission to the Planning Inspectorate.									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1105-0001	Individual	Mr	Sammons				SP3	No	Dear Sir/Madam, I DO NOT support the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft Consultation. I DO NOT consider the draft plan to be legally compliant. Reason: It has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, consistent with national policy	I DO NOT consider the draft plan to be sound. Reason: 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 e.g. Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites. 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. The 3,316+ urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. Other examples of Canvey not being a viable alternative	No five year housing land supply				A	Doesn't meet the housing target Flood risk on Canvey Third road Infrastructure	Doesn't meet the housing target 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. While the Plan does not meet the standard method housing requirement, this does not automatically mean that it is not sound. A sound plan must be based on a robust and credible evidence base and reflect the realities and constraints of the area. The proposed housing figure is justified by robust evidence which the Council will set out during the examination. 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 management 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		
											location are: Road network is already strangled by high volumes of traffic, in particular during rush hour periods. To address this would not only require the much needed third road being built but a major reworking of the existing routes so that they do converge at Waterside roundabout and more lanes being added. Also Sadlers farm roundabout was poorly designed as the route off the A13 is only 2 lanes and therefore includes traffic going to North and South Benfleet and the traffic going to Canvey has to sit in a queue and then negotiate 2 sets of traffic lights before getting onto a Canvey Way (aka Remembrance Avenue) which is only a single land road. The health care is also already stretched and without additional Doctors/Dentists etc would not be able to provide adequate care for the residents. Investment would require to be made in additional schools in												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 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 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 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
										particular another secondary school would be essential, as the demolition of Furtherwick Park school to facilitate the relocation of Castleview School reduced this from 3 to 2. Has the bus and train routes been considered as with this number of additional residents commuter routes will become overcrowded and potentially unusable? This list is by no means exhaustive but a mere example of some of the issues that will require to be considered before approving the proposed plan.								supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).			
1107-0002	Sue	Jackson				SP3		No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/Grey Belt.	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						The Castle Point is not consistent with national policy as it does not meet the standard methodology housing target. Considers that there is overdevelopment in urban areas particularly on Canvey Island and that Green Belt Sites should have been allocated for development instead.	The Castle Point Plan is underpinned by an evidence base including a Green Belt Assessment based on government guidelines and a housing topic paper which considered further criteria including impact on designated sites, transport and environmental impacts including flood risk. The evidence supported the regeneration and densification of urban sites	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 Brownfield sites". Not considered all sites, no Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.									
1108-0002	Vickey	Stark ey				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.		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					Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400			Greenbelt/ Grey Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.							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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.

In light of these issues, at our last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal and have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families.

As Chair and representative of 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
1109-0002	Robert	Martin				SP3			No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/Grey Belt.		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							Objects to the level of development proposed at Canvey Island as it would impact on the access routes on and off the island, particularly during an emergency evacuation. Considers that residents with limited digital access had	The Castle Point Plan considers improved access to Canvey Island in Policy C5 to support the proposed development. The Public Consultation included drop in events on Canvey Island on 20th August, 22nd August, 18th September and 25th September, residents could provide their responses either during the event or via postal letter. The Council has considered its housing strategy carefully and what can realistically 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
							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					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, and H031. 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.						limited access to the public consultation. Considers that the Castle Point Plan is not consistent with national policy as it delivers less houses than the standard methodology housing target. Considers that more Green Belt sites should have been allocated.	achieved within its boundaries taking into account its environmental and physical constraints. This has been based on evidence from the Green Belt Assessment, The Housing Topic Paper and the Strategic Land Availability Assessments. The evidence supported a lower housing delivery of 6,196 houses with a strategy of regeneration and urban densification.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion. In light of these issues, at our last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families.

As Chair and representative of the Residents Association I would also like to participate at the oral examination and be invited to speak on their behalf. I enclose the signature sheets completed by the residents, together with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown 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
1110-0002	Andrew	Elliot				SP3		No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.		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, and H031. 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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great										and drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

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

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown above.															
1111-0002	Philip	Moran				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.	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						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents;					Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.							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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked.

Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off 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
11-0002	Steven	Hutton				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.		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, and H031. 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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great										and drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

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

difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked.

Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.

In light of these issues, at

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal and have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families.

As Chair and representative of the Residents Association I would also like to participate at the oral examination and be invited to speak on their behalf. I enclose the signature sheets completed by the residents, together

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown above.														
1113-0002	Maureen	Martin				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.	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						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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.					Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.					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.		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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked.

Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off of

[illegible]

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
11-0002	Pauline	Jones				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.		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, and H031. 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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great										and drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

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
								difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion. In light of these issues, at																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal and have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families.

As Chair and representative of the Residents Association I would also like to participate at the oral examination and be invited to speak on their behalf. I enclose the signature sheets completed by the residents, together

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown above.															
1115-0002	Derek	Warren				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.	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						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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.					Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.					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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked.

Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off 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
11-0002	Sharon	Moran				SP3		No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.		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, and H031. 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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great										and drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

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
								difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion. In light of these issues, at																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal and have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families.

As Chair and representative of the Residents Association I would also like to participate at the oral examination and be invited to speak on their behalf. I enclose the signature sheets completed by the residents, together

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown above.															
1117-0002	Edward	Edwards				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.	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							Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents;			Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.								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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked.

Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off 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
							Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion. In light of these issues, at our last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal and have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families. As Chair and representative of the Residents														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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

Association I would also like to participate at the oral examination and be invited to speak on their behalf. I enclose the signature sheets completed by the residents, together with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown 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
11-0002	Robert	Jones				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.		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, and H031.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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.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.	Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard methodThrough robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing deliveryCastle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.Housing Supply – 5 Year SupplyHousing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply.North-West ThundersleyNorthwest 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 preferred.Consideration of All SitesAll reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).Green Belt/Grey Belt Green Belt/Grey belt covered	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty												under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown above.															
1119-0002	William	Shotton				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.	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						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents;			Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.								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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked.

Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off 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

Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.

In light of these issues, at our last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal and have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families.

As Chair and representative of the Residents

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1120-0002	Barbara	Hamer				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.		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, and H031. 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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great										and drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown above.														
11-21-0002	Margaret	Brennan				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.	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						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents;			Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.								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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?		First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1122-0002	Rosemary	Grimsey				SP3		No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/Grey Belt.		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, and H031. 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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great										and drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

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
								difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion. In light of these issues, at																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown above.														
1123-0002	Ian	Grimsey				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.	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						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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.					Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.					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.		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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked.

Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off 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
1124-0002	Joyce	Sanders				SP3		No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.		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, and H031. 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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great										and drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

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
								difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion. In light of these issues, at																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal and have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families.																
								As Chair and representative of the Residents Association I would also like to participate at the oral examination and be invited to speak on their behalf. I enclose the signature sheets completed by the residents, together																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown above.														
1125-0002	Graham	Sanders				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.	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						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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.					Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.					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.	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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked.

Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation. This highlights once again the need for a third road off 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

Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion.

In light of these issues, at our last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal and have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families.

As Chair and representative of the Residents

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?		First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1126-0002	Brenda	Tanner				SP3		No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.		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, and H031. 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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great										and drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

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
								difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked. Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off of Canvey and it is our opinion that this must form part of the Local Plan. The majority of Canvey's residents are of the same opinion. In light of these issues, at																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal and have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families.

As Chair and representative of the Residents Association I would also like to participate at the oral examination and be invited to speak on their behalf. I enclose the signature sheets completed by the residents, together

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown above.														
1127-0002	John	Tanner				SP3		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	No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/ Grey Belt.	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						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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.					Belt sites added, with the exclusion of North West Thundersley, and H031. 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.					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.		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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great difficulty getting off the park and onto the main route off the island as they would already be gridlocked.

Then there is the issue of those residents who are disabled, house-bound/bed-bound. This would obviously increase the time needed for evacuation . This highlights once again the need for a third road off of

1262

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?		First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1128-0002	Christine	Tuggey				SP3		No	Not justified; not consistent with NPPF; biased against Greenbelt/Grey Belt.		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, and H031. 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.						Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply. 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <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>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u>	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Design	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								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. There are 870 homes on Kings Park with approximately 1,400 residents; we have serious concerns as to how they would be able to evacuate the island in the event of a flood or major incident. Our position on the island means that we would have great										and drainage infrastructure.	Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.			

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

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 last committee meeting we voted to support the residents with their objections, and have collected 131 signatures in support of an alternative proposal and have completed a joint response form in order to represent our residents and their families.

As Chair and representative of the Residents Association I would also like to participate at the oral examination and be invited to speak on their behalf. I enclose the signature sheets completed by the residents, together

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								with the completed Joint Response form and should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge receipt using the email address shown above.														
1129-0001	Individual	Simone	Caldecourt			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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,	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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,	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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 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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1130-0001	Individual	Pat	Moore			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
							response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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		housing target of 11,000.					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	delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
11-0001	Individual	Iris	Staley				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1132-0001	Individual	Carol	Simmons			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1133-0001	Individual	Ken	Childs			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1134-0001	Individual	Jan	Childs				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1135-0001	Individual	Jan	Sinclair			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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					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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1136-0001	Individual	Angela	Riggs			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1137-0001	Individual	Edward	Howard			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1138-0001	Individual	Mario	Davies			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1139-0001	Individual	Kenneth	Green			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1140-0001	Individual	Richard	Ivory				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1141-0001	Individual	Angela	Ivory			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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					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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1142-0001	Individual	Alan	Dyer			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1143-0001	Individual	Angela	Reading			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.	
1144-0001	Individual	Sheila	Durrance			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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					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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1145-0001	Individual	Robert	Spicer			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1146-0001	Individual	Sheila	Spicer			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing deliveryCastle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).SUDsPolicy 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.			
1147-0001	Individual	Patricia	Belcher			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1148-0001	Individual	Brenda	Gorham			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1149-0001	Individual	Barbara	Montgomery			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1150-0001	Individual	Ron	Rowe			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1151-0001	Individual	Jan	Rowe			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1152-0001	Individual	Janete	Green			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1153-0001	Individual	Joan	McGilligan			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1154-0001	Individual	Roger	Webber			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1155-0001	Individual	Sylvia	Hobday				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1156-0001	Individual	Robert	Heard			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1157-0001	Individual	Elizabeth	Heard			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1158-0001	Individual	Corinne	Young			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1159-0001	Individual	Mary	Robinson			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1160-0001	Individual	Jean	Starbuck			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1161-0001	Individual	Jean	Raeside				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1162-0001	Individual	Mureen	Demering			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1163-0001	Individual	David	Eve			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1164-0001	Individual	Samantha	Ball			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1165-0001	Individual	Jacqueline	Mosedale			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1166-0001	Individual	Irene	Mitchell			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1167-0001	Individual	Peter	Davis			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1168-0001	Individual	Eileen	Davis			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1169-0001	Individual	Heleen	Wright			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1170-0001	Individual	Derek	Champion			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1171-0001	Individual	Harry	Page			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1172-0001	Individual	Sylvia	Page			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1173-0001	Individual	Lilian	Eniffer			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1174-0001	Individual	Linda	Carroll			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1175-0001	Individual	Andy	Carroll			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing deliveryCastle Point's	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1176-0001	Individual	Russell	Aubin				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1177-0001	Individual	Carole	Aubin			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1178-0001	Individual	Kenneth	Hall			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1179-0001	Individual	Patricia	Cantwell			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1180-0001	Individual	Bernard	Lewin			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1181-0001	Individual	Michael	Hillman			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1182-0001	Individual	Clive	Schooling			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1183-0001	Individual	Victor	Whelan			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (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.			
1184-0001	Individual	Jeane	Sizer			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1185-0001	Individual	Julie	Titheradge			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1186-0001	Individual	Mr B	Hodgson			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1187-0001	Individual	Mrs B	Hodgson			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1188-0001	Individual	Pauline	Oddy				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.									
1189-0001	Individual	Janet	Burton				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1190-0001	Individual	Carol	Charles			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1191-0001	Individual	Melvin	Jarvis			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1192-0001	Individual	Sandra	Jarvis			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1193-0001	Individual	David	Canty			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1194-0001	Individual	Stephen	Edgeworth			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1195-0001	Individual	Barbara	Waters			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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					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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1196-0001	Individual	Norman	Neild			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1197-0001	Individual	Jill	Watts				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1198-0001	Individual	Malcolm	Dyer			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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			Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1199-0001	Individual	Roger	Laker				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1200-0001	Individual	Edward	Childs				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1201-0001	Individual	David	Jones			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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					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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1202-0001	Individual	John	Mogford			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1203-0001	Individual	Barbara	Radley			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led					3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1204-0001	Individual	Daphne	McQuade			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing deliveryCastle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1205-0001	Individual	David	White			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1206-0001	Individual	Brian	Norman			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.	
1207-0001	Individual	Mary	Drummond			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1208-0001	Individual	Chris	Silvester			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1209-0001	Individual	Christine	Lockwood			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1210-0001	Individual	Mark	Lockwood			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1211-0001	Individual	Heather	Shackleton			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1212-0001	Individual	Karen	Langworth			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1213-0001	Individual	Anne	Roud			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1214-0001	Individual	Margaret	White			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.					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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1215-0001	Individual	Kenneth	Carter			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1216-0001	Individual	Dorothy	Carter			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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					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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1217-0001	Individual	Eunice	Sawyer			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1218-0001	Individual	Matthew	Lindsay			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1219-0001	Individual	Susan	Lindsay			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (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.			
1220-0001	Individual	Janet	Norman			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
12-0001	Individual	Kenneth	Sheilds			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1222-0001	Individual	Susan	Webb			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1223-0001	Individual	Maggie	Webb			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1224-0001	Individual	Date	Gowler			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1225-0001	Individual	Ken	Heard			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1226-0001	Individual	Carol	Heard				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1227-0001	Individual	Terry	Caws				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led							3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1228-0001	Individual	Raymond	Baker			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1229-0001	Individual	Mr A	Oliver			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1230-0001	Individual	Mrs P	Oliver			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												Canvey is not resident led									
1231-0001	Individual	Jacqueline	Hounsome				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1232-0001	Individual	Susan	Reed			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1233-0001	Individual	Daniel	Davies				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing deliveryCastle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).SUDsPolicy 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.			
1234-0001	Individual	James	Montgomery			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (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.		
1235-0001	Individual	Christine	Payne			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1236-0001	Individual	Barbara	Hedges			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1237-0001	Individual	John	Potts			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (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.			
1238-0001	Individual	Sue	Cameroon			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1239-0001	Individual	Steve	Clifford			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1240-0001	Individual	Angela	Harris			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1241-0001	Individual	Terry	Hill			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1242-0001	Individual	Robert	Hawkins			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1243-0001	Individual	Mr K	Chandler			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1244-0001	Individual	Den	Chandler			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1245-0001	Individual	Thomas	Newton			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1246-0001	Individual	Michael	Rogers			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1247-0001	Individual	Colin	Bywater			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1248-0001	Individual	Steve	Ellis			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1249-0001	Individual	Jill	Ellis			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1250-0001	Individual	Colin	ODonovan			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1251-0001	Individual	Philomena	Odonovan			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1252-0001	Individual	Anastasia	Power			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1253-0001	Individual	Brian	Thomas			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1254-0001	Individual	Edwina	Ford				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1255-0001	Individual	Linda	Claydon			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1256-0001	Individual	Pamela	Warren			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1257-0001	Individual	John	Hill				SP3 No This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1258-0001	Individual	Susan	Laurie			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (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.		
1259-0001	Individual	Eric	Burnham			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1260-0001	Individual	Janice	Dawkins			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1261-0001	Individual	Jean	Hagger			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1262-0001	Individual	Patricia	Ruff			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing deliveryCastle Point's	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1263-0001	Individual	Marilyn	Hellicar			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1264-0001	Individual	Jackie	Brown			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1265-0001	Individual	Peter	Hosier			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1266-0001	Individual	Paul	Scott			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led					3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1267-0001	Individual	Gwenida	Gatrell			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1268-0001	Individual	June	Hooper			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1269-0001	Individual	Teresa	Barwick			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1270-0001	Individual	Thomas	McClenaghan			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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					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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1271-0001	Individual	Norma	Reis			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1272-0001	Individual	Steven	Lowe				SP3 No This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1273-0001	Individual	Anthony	Smith			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1274-0001	Individual	Theresa	Grant			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1275-0001	Individual	Kim	Rawling			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1276-0001	Individual	Roger	Sains			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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					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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1277-0001	Individual	Linda	Tebb			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1278-0001	Individual	Peter	Reed			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1279-0001	Individual	Alan	Price			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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					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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1280-0001	Individual	Lesley	Taylor			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1281-0001	Individual	Jean	Davies			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1282-0001	Individual	Barbara	Letch			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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					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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1283-0001	Individual	Dawn	Young			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total				Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1284-0001	Individual	Raymond	O'Callaghan			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1285-0001	Individual	Joan	O'Callaghan			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1286-0001	Individual	John	Hammond			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.				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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1287-0001	Individual	Mr A J	Taylor				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1288-0001	Individual	Mrs AJ	Taylor			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1289-0001	Individual	Anita	Shean			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
							to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1290-0001	Individual	John	Shean			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1291-0001	Individual	Albert	Leatham			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing deliveryCastle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1292-0001	Individual	Stephen	Fox			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1293-0001	Individual	Sylvia	Fox				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			
1294-0001	Individual	Linda	Freeman			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1295-0001	Individual	James	Gray			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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		housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1296-0001	Individual	Anthony	Johnson			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1297-0001	Individual	Patrick	Gardiner			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1298-0001	Individual	Joan	McCulloch			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1299-0001	Individual	Eileen	Janes				SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1300-0001	Individual	Susan	Bass			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1301-0001	Individual	Christine	Eaglestone			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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	housing target of 11,000.					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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1302-0001	Individual	June	Marsterson			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant,	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				Canvey is not resident led						3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led		and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1303-0001	Individual	Brian	Marsterson			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.		
1308-0001	Individual	Michael	Ford		Yes	SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy		We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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						Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.				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						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	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <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 SFRA.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1309-0001	Individual	Kay	Pumfrey			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1310-0002	Individual	L	West				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1311-0002	Individual	Dorothy	Panter			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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 examination		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Modifications Required
																				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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1312-0002	Individual	Vickey	Starkey			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1313-0002	Individual	Alan	West			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
13-0002	Individual	Graham	Titheradge			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																			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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1315-0002	Individual	Mrs J	Titherage			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1316-0002	Individual	Valerie	Hawkins			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1317-0002	Individual	John	Hawkins				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1318-0002	Individual	Leonara	Mallake			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supplyNorth West Thundersley shgould have been includedApproach to Green/Grey BeltNPPF 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.	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, 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 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 housing topic paper.North West ThundersleyNorth West Thundersley is in the Green	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).		

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
																				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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1319-0002	Individual	Janet	Almond			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1320-0002	Individual	M	Glover				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																		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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1321-0002	Individual	J	Glover				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1322-0002	Individual	Reg	Baker				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																				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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1323-0002	Individual	Christine	Bentham			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																		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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1324-0002	Individual	Irene	Sambrook			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First 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
																		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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1325-0002	Individual	Julie	Hicks			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1326-0002	Individual	Brian	Hicks			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1327-0002	Individual	Sharon	Porter			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1328-0002	Individual	Shell	Hull			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1329-0002	Individual	Terry	Wildman			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1330-0002	Individual	Brenda	Tanner			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1331-0002	Individual	Mrs L	Coyte				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																			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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1332-0002	Individual	S	Byrne				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1333-0002	Individual	S	Clarke			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																				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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1334-0002	Individual	Pam	Maley			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1335-0002	Individual	Jame	Willis			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1336-0002	Individual	Julie	Hutton				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supplyNorth West Thundersley shgould have been includedApproach to Green/Grey BeltNPPF 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.	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, 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 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 housing topic paper.North West ThundersleyNorth West Thundersley is in the Green	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).		

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
																				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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1337-0002	Individual	Joyce	Doughty			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1338-0002	Individual	Steve	Hutton			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1339-0002	Individual	Janet	Mitchell			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1340-0002	Individual	Ivy	Fisher				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1341-0002	Individual	D	Huckle				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1342-0002	Individual	Larry	Coyte			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1343-0002	Individual	Beryl	Stewart			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1344-0002	Individual	Tracy	Dufosse				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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.			Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1345-0002	Individual	Linda	Cooper			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1346-0002	Individual	Christopher	Murphy				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1347-0002	Individual	Marie	Stephenson				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1348-0002	Individual	J	Milton				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1349-0002	Individual	D	Tuggey				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1350-0002	Individual	Joy	Baker			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																				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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1351-0002	Individual	J	Malpas				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1352-0002	Individual	Mrs VM	Allen			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1353-0002	Individual	June	Moxhay			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1354-0002	Individual	Martin	English			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supplyNorth West Thundersley shgould have been includedApproach to Green/Grey BeltNPPF 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.	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, 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 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 housing topic paper.North West ThundersleyNorth West Thundersley is in the Green	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).		

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
																				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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1355-0002	Individual	Doreen	Hunnabale				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1356-0002	Individual	Julie	Cashman			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1357-0002	Individual	Ian	Grimsey				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1358-0002	Individual	Linda	Conlon			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1359-0002	Individual	Francis	Hammond				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1360-0002	Individual	Jean	Cole				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1361-0002	Individual	S	Rabey			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1362-0002	Individual	Christine	Le-May				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1363-0002	Individual	Linda	Godley			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .		

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1364-0002	Individual	Wendy	Edwards				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1365-0002	Individual	Jane	Grimmer			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																			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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1366-0002	Individual	Norman	Warn				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																			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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1367-0002	Individual	Patricia	Careswell			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																		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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1368-0002	Individual	Steven	Tilley			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																		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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1369-0002	Individual	Terry	Wood				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																				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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1370-0002	Individual	Susan	Tilley			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1371-0002	Individual	Barbara	Harmer			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).		

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1372-0002	Individual	Maurice	Vale			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supplyNorth West Thundersley should have been includedApproach to Green/Grey BeltNPPF 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.	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, 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 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 housing topic paper.North West ThundersleyNorth West Thundersley is in the Green	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .		

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
																				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 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 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1373-0002	Individual	Patricia	Baker			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																					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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1374-0002	Individual	Monica	Clark				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1375-0002	Individual	Rosemary	Grimsey			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1376-0002	Individual	Janet	Dinaline				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																				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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1377-0002	Individual	Sharon	Moran			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																				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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1378-0002	Individual	Philip	Moran				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1379-0002	Individual	Ann	Eldridge			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1380-0002	Individual	Mrs V	Norris				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1381-0002	Individual	Mrs F	Packham			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																				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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1382-0002	Individual	John	Tanner			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) .	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

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	Modifications Required
																				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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1383-0002	Individual	Janet	Baker			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.		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. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

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
																						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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?		3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1384-0002	Individual	S	Dillon				SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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.	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. Total housing target of 11,000.		No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt 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.	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 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 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	Y - Policy SD3(3) 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council’s SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																						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. 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, 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			

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 examination		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Modifications Required
																				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. Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), 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.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1412-0001	Individual	Mega n	Stone			Yes	SP3	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.	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				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt	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 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 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.		N
																			North West 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
																				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. 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, 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			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			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.		
1413-0001	Individual	Beryl	Disney		Yes	SP3	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	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				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt	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 Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is	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
														of the North West Thundersley site.							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 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 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 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 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
14 14 - 00 01	Individual	Alan	Disney			Yes	SP3	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.	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				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt	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 placed, 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 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 housing topic paper.		N
																			North West Thundersley			

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
																					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. 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, 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		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																			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.		
1417-0001	Individual	Sue	Stevens		Not Stated	SP3	Not Stated	Planning for Glebelands I strongly disagree with these plans going ahead. As if there is not enough cars on the road from Sadlers to tarpots .. To take away more Green Belt Land. All the lorries etc needed to build .Lots of burst water pipes from Sadlers to Tarpots									Objections concerning Glebelands. Highways concerns and loss of Green Belt land.	The plan doesn't allocate any Green Belt land for development.	N		

[illegible]

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1422-0001	Individual	Carli	Bannan			Yes	SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and 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 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, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.					Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley No credible five-year housing land supply. 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. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <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 preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and	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
																		supporting Green Belt Assessments.			
14-0001	Individual	Sheila	Clifford		Yes	SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has 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	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. Total housing target of 11,000.					Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply. 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. The NPPF guidelines state	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 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. <u>Housing Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply. <u>Green Belt</u> The Green Belt Assessment July 2025 reviewed all potential sites within Castle Point's Green Belt, these sites were then considered against further criteria including: environmental and heritage designations, flood risk, highways issues which impact viability, sustainability as well as having regard for the Essex LNRS and strategic opportunity areas for biodiversity improvements.	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
												appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.					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 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. Total housing target of 11,000.		Any potential grey belt sites identified within the Green Belt Assessment July 2025, were reviewed. However, none were considered suitable for development as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> 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 SFRA.		
14-27-0003	Individual	Danny	Brady		Yes	SP3	Not Stated	I am totally against any building on green belt or redefined green to gray belt.	Not Stated								Against any building on green belt or redefined green to gray belt.	Noted		N	
14-28-0001	Individual	G	Reeves-Nurse			SP3	Not Stated	Future building on Canvey Island is dangerous,	Not Stated								Future building on Canvey Island is dangerous, for the following reasons:-	Flooding and infrastructure covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation 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
								for the following reasons:- The Island flooded with loss of life and it is possible it could happen again. There is not adequate roads for hundreds more cars, it is currently bad anyhow, for access on and off the Island. There are not adequate schools, GPs, dentists, medical services, shops of all descriptions, no emergency hospital service, no police station and lack of policing. I hope this helps the council decide not to build more houses on Canvey Island.									The Island flooded with loss of life and it is possible it could happen again. There is not adequate roads for hundreds more cars, it is currently bad anyhow, for access on and off the Island. There are not adequate schools, GPs, dentists, medical services, shops of all descriptions, no emergency hospital service, no police station and lack of policing. I hope this helps the council decide not to build more houses on Canvey Island.	Canvey. Canvey 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				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1430-0001	Individual	Roger	Webber			Yes	SP3	Not Stated					The infrastructure on Canvey cannot cope with the of Gridlocked Roads every day. Sewerage, Drainage cannot cope now! Evacuation of people of people on the Island to safely. Is there a plan? Easier access for all the Emergency services at any time of day to get to where they are needed urgently. Road maintenance will increase. We do not have enough Doctors, Dentist now, most of the surgeries are full. Schools, pre-schools I find it strange that you have that produce a 219-page plan. I would like to know how much the plan costs and how many people were needed. I know you are very busy with what you do but what affect did this work effect their work. Did you need to employ Consultants. I get the feeling that you have made your mind up and you are wasting money which could have been use for more sensible projects. Who paid for all the plans? Please can	Would it be possible for a meeting with a few Kings Park Village residents.					Concerned about highways impacts, infrastructure, drainage, emergency access. Concerned about the cost of the Plan. Wants a meeting arranged with a few Kings Park Village residents.	Infrastructure: Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Flooding: Flood risk covered in policies SD1-3 and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). 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 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 The Plan went on consultatiin including public events attended by Council staff and planning officers, all residents were welcome to attend and discuss the Plan, or particular aspects of the 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
								Island is to the south of the Borough and is the largest town in Castle Point with around 40,000 residents. Surely before we can entertain the 3,143 homes, with appropriately 6,286 extra cars for the extra homes, we need to be sure that it is feasible to have so many vehicles added to what we have.																

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
1436-0001	Individual	Ian	Bussey			Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Effective, Justified	I write to submit representations on the Draft Castle Point Plan (Regulation 19) in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and in respect of the four tests of soundness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) paragraph 35. I request that my comments be duly made part of the consultation record and forwarded to the Inspector appointed to examine the Plan. Representation in summary: I contend that the Plan fails to meet the “justified” and “effective” tests of soundness because the spatial strategy and evidence base do not adequately demonstrate that the selected strategy is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives, nor that the Plan is deliverable within the Plan period. In particular, I raise significant concerns in	The Plan should include a clearer viability and phasing schedule for strategic infrastructure delivery. It should identify which infrastructure items are critical to the delivery of strategic allocations, set out funding sources, responsibilities, timescales and trigger points for delivery. The Plan should include a commitment to review early if delivery falls behind schedule, with clear wording that triggers a fallback strategy (for example, if strategic sites cannot be delivered then alternative sites will be allocated). The spatial strategy should provide a more robust assessment of reasonable alternatives, including scenarios with less reliance on Green Belt release and more focus on urban intensification or brownfield redevelopment, and demonstrate why the chosen	Yes	To discuss these points further at the hearing			The Plan fails to meet the “justified” and “effective” tests of soundness because the spatial strategy and evidence base do not adequately demonstrate that the selected strategy is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives, nor that the Plan is deliverable within the Plan period. In particular, I raise significant concerns in relation to the treatment of Green Belt release and strategic infrastructure capacity. In respect of the soundness tests: I do not believe the Plan is justified (i.e., that it is based on a robust and credible assessment of the reasonable alternatives) in that the supporting evidence does not adequately demonstrate that the release of Green Belt land, or other strategic allocations, represent the most appropriate	Duty to Cooperate is addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. <u>Infrastructure</u> : Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Flooding: Flood risk covered in policies SD1-3 and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>Reasonable Options</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	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
												relation to the treatment of Green Belt release and strategic infrastructure capacity. In respect of the soundness tests: I do not believe the Plan is justified (i.e., that it is based on a robust and credible assessment of the reasonable alternatives) in that the supporting evidence does not adequately demonstrate that the release of Green Belt land, or other strategic allocations, represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. I also contend the Plan is not effective (i.e., it is not deliverable and cannot be implemented as intended) because the evidence indicates that strategic infrastructure constraints mean the spatial strategy cannot be delivered within the Plan period. Paragraph 32 of the NPPF requires that local plans should be prepared on the basis of proportionate evidence. I note	approach is preferred. The Plan should strengthen the duty to cooperate evidence by including signed Statements of Common Ground (or equivalent binding arrangements) with neighbouring authorities and infrastructure providers to demonstrate cross-boundary infrastructure constraints are addressed.					strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. I also contend the Plan is not effective (i.e., it is not deliverable and cannot be implemented as intended) because the evidence indicates that strategic infrastructure constraints mean the spatial strategy cannot be delivered within the Plan period. The Plan should strengthen the duty to cooperate evidence by including signed Statements of Common Ground (or equivalent binding arrangements) with neighbouring authorities and infrastructure providers to demonstrate cross-boundary infrastructure constraints are addressed.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										that the Council acknowledges infrastructure constraints in relation to certain strategic sites and that these constraints have implications for deliverability. For example, the FAQs on the Council website state that with respect to north-west Thundersley the Council considers that “the strategic infrastructure works required ... cannot be undertaken during the time period of the Plan”. CastlePoint If parts of the spatial strategy rely on sites whose infrastructure cannot realistically be delivered within the Plan period, this undermines the Plan’s effectiveness and casts doubt on the justification of the chosen strategy. I also understand that concerns have been raised about the Council’s duty to cooperate and cross-boundary infrastructure. A commentary on the plan notes: “the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary											

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							
														infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern". Canvey Green Belt Campaign The NPPF paragraph 35 states that a plan is sound if it is "positively prepared", "justified", "effective" and "consistent with national policy". Where a plan does not properly evaluate reasonable alternatives or cannot show how it will be delivered, it fails the 'justified' and 'effective' limbs. Although the Council has published an evidence base, the mere existence of evidence is insufficient; the evidence must demonstrate that the selected strategy is the most appropriate, and that the Plan is realistic and deliverable. I consider the evidence insofar as it relates to strategic infrastructure and release of Green Belt land to fall short of this requirement. Conclusion I respectfully ask the Council to treat																	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 representation as a formal objection under Regulation 19, and to ensure that the Inspector is provided with a copy. The issues raised go to the heart of whether the Plan is justified and effective. Unless addressed, I consider the Plan fails the soundness tests and risks being found unsound at examination.									
0958-0001	Individual	Philip	Howe	The People's Independent Party	Yes	SP3	Yes		Yes			I strongly support the Plan's strategy to meet housing needs primarily through brownfield regeneration and urban capacity optimisation, thereby upholding the strong community commitment to protecting the Green Belt. This demonstrates the Council has been positively prepared and has appropriately responded to the strong direction in the revised NPPF to be ambitious with brownfield land and avoid Green Belt release where possible.	Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		I strongly support the Plan's strategy to meet housing needs primarily through brownfield regeneration and urban capacity optimisation, thereby upholding the strong community commitment to protecting the Green Belt. This demonstrates the Council has been positively prepared and has appropriately responded to the strong direction in the revised NPPF to be ambitious with brownfield land and avoid Green Belt release where possible.	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
0958-0006	Individual	Philip	Howe	The People's Independent Party	Yes	SP3	Yes		Yes			I support the Council's approach to determining the housing requirement. The strategy to focus delivery within the existing urban footprint, rather than relying on unsustainable Green Belt sites, is the most appropriate and Justified response given the severe physical and environmental constraints of the Borough, including high flood risk and limited highway capacity.		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		I support the Council's approach to determining the housing requirement. The strategy to focus delivery within the existing urban footprint, rather than relying on unsustainable Green Belt sites, is the most appropriate and Justified response given the severe physical and environmental constraints of the Borough, including high flood risk and limited highway capacity.	Support noted.		N
1002-0002	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	SP3	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	No	Positively prepared		The requirements of the Framework with regard Plan making. 1.1 Paragraph 36 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that 'plans are sound if they are...positively prepared, and provide a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs'. 1.2 Paragraph 62 states that 'to determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		Perceived under-delivery of housing.	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.		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					
								through the consultation period.					should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the Standard Method in national planning practice guidance'. 1.3 The Council's Housing Capacity Topic Paper (2025) recognises (at paragraph 3.5) that when applying the Standard Method as required by the Framework in arriving at an overall minimum housing need figure, the Castle Point Plan should seek to deliver 11,662 new homes over the Plan period (686 per annum x 17 years). The approach taken by the draft Plan. 1.4 The draft Castle Point Plan does not seek to deliver at least the minimum number of homes required, when utilising the Standard Method. Instead, it seeks to deliver 6,196 homes, entirely in existing 'urban areas' (i.e. on previously developed land). To achieve this figure, the Plan relies on a series of proposed allocations, existing commitments 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		
										windfall over the Plan period. 1.5 The Plan seeks to deliver just over half of Castle Point’s objectively assessed need, with a shortfall of 5,466 homes over the plan period, or 321 per annum in each of the 17 years of the Plan. Such an approach does not meet the requirement to ‘positively prepare’ a Plan, and the draft Castle Point Plan is therefore unsound. 1.6 Given that the shortfall against objectively assessed need is so great, we have not forensically explored the availability, suitability or deliverability of the sites that the Plan does propose to allocate. Although, taking the example of the proposed Hadleigh Town Centre Broad Area (Had1), we have seen nothing in the Council’s Evidence Base to indicate there is sufficient available land within the town centre to deliver a minimum of 388 new homes, that a scheme can be brought forward of a suitable design 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. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 at the proposed 125dph, or that there is any capacity to lose existing town centre car parks. It seems likely that the total number of homes proposed by the draft Plan is likely to be found unrealistic under scrutiny. 1.7 The Housing Capacity Topic Paper identifies at paragraph 4.18 that the borough's existing settlements cannot sustainably absorb 686 homes per annum (the need calculated with reference to the Standard Method) within urban areas. That being the case, the correct approach is to turn to land outside of the existing urban areas in Castle Point to 'make up' the substantial shortfall in supply against need. All land outside of existing boundaries of urban areas in Castle Point is designated as Green Belt. Consequentially, the Council will need to turn to releasing Green Belt land for new homes to meet the needs of its communities.															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												1.8 The Hadleigh Farm Estate (site reference GB8) has been mis-assessed in the Council's evidence base documents to the Plan and on proper analysis, and when seeking to meet the actual need for homes in Castle Point, should be allocated for development in the Plan.									
1002-0003	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	SP3	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		SEE ATTACHMENT FOR TABLES AND FIGURES Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025). 3.1 The Council's Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025) 'sifts' Green Belt land within the Borough, first with reference to what it calls 'critical or strong constraints'. The land promoted for development at the Hadleigh Estate is not constrained by any of the factors considered in this assessment as is shown in the extract below. 3.2 As such, the site is identified by the Housing Capacity Topic Paper as being 'potentially unconstrained	Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		Promoites site GB8	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		
												Green Belt', as reflected in the extract below (taken from pg. 33 of the document). 3.3 Paragraph 12.4 of the Housing Capacity Topic Paper confirms that transport analysis of the Green Belt sites promoted for allocation in the Plan (including this site, 'GB8'), as set presented at Regulation 18 stage did not identify problems with the transport network in accommodating these sites, other than in the case of northwest of Thundersley. This demonstrates that the development of 'GB8' can be accommodated within the highways network, subject to mitigation. 3.4 Whilst paragraph 12.12 of the Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025) concludes that 'it is appropriate and in accordance with the NPPF to avoid development in the Green Belt [generally] as it would not be sustainably located and would impact on traffic capacity on the local											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam		6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required			
											highway network' that conclusion does not hold true in the case of the Hadleigh Estate, where elsewhere in the Council's evidence base the site is shown to be sustainably located and compatible with the capacity of the highways network, with 'high connectivity' (see Figure 1.1.4 above). We have explained the access strategy for the site in further detail below. The site Access Strategy. Walking and Cycling. 3.5 The site masterplan is being developed to ensure excellent pedestrian and cyclist connectivity to the local area, and to provide attractive walking and cycling routes through the development. To the north of the site there is footway provision on Chapel Lane and Castle Lane and both streets are residential in character, with street lighting and 30mph speed limits. These roads are also relatively lightly trafficked. Pedestrian 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						
												cycle access can be provided along these routes which provide convenient walking and cycling routes towards the local services and facilities within Hadleigh. 3.6 Connections for pedestrians and cyclists can also be provided onto the A13 (both via the site frontage and via Park Chase) and to the east of the site linking to Leigh-on-Sea as part of the proposed development. These accesses, in combination with new strategic walking and cycling routes across the site, will improve pedestrian and cycle access for both new and existing residents between Hadleigh and Leigh-on-Sea. 3.7 The existing Public Rights of Way (PROW) through the site can be retained and enhanced. Vehicular Access 3.8 Vehicular access can be achieved to the site from two new accesses onto the A13. The primary vehicle access into the site would be a three-arm roundabout															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?			Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications		5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required							
														located broadly in the centre of the site. To achieve this, the A13 would be realigned into the site immediately either side of the new roundabout and a service road would be provided to retain access to existing properties to the north. This has the benefit of minimising the impact of the access on the existing trees along the southern side of the A13 and the existing properties on the northern side of the road. 3.9 A secondary, smaller vehicle access would be provided at the eastern end of the site in the form of a ghost island priority junction (allowing vehicles to turn into the site from both directions, but only allowing vehicles to turn left out of the site). Fewer vehicles would use this access, and it would be intended to serve a small number of homes at the eastern end of the site. 3.10 It is proposed that these two new accesses with the A13 would be the primary vehicular accesses to 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
										site, designed to serve the majority of the development. Two small parcels of new homes are then proposed to be accessed via Castle Lane and Chapel Lane. 3.11 Only pedestrians and cyclists would be able to route between the proposed A13 accesses and Castle Lane. This would ensure that a limited number of new houses would be accessed from Chapel Lane and Castle Lane so that these routes are retained as attractive walking and cycling routes. Promoting sustainable transport. 3.12 The UK Government has set out the impact of transport on carbon emissions and within the document ‘Decarbonising Transport: A Greener, Better Britain’ there are numerous commitments to encouraging modal shift to active travel modes to reduce carbon emissions. The land being promoted for development 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			
												ideally located to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport as opposed to the private car, to assist with reducing carbon emissions associated with transport. Local Services and Facilities. 3.13 Hadleigh High Street is within a 12-minute walk and a 4-minute cycle of the development and has a number of everyday services and facilities including supermarkets, shops, cafes, restaurants, takeaways, pubs, a pharmacy and hairdressers. Hadleigh Infant and Junior School is also within a 15-20-minute walk and a 6-7-minute cycle. The site is therefore ideally located to encourage travel by active modes, and there is good provision for pedestrians and cyclists which can be improved between the site and these destinations to encourage trips on foot and by bike. Public Transport. 3.14 The A13 is a key public												

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
										transport corridor in the area and the bus stops along the A13 (which the site fronts) are served by very frequent services (every 5 minutes in both directions) providing links to key employment, shopping, education and leisure destinations. There is an opportunity to provide a mobility hub near the access and existing bus services on the A13 to facilitate the interchange between walking, cycling and public transport. The site therefore benefits from excellent access to bus services to encourage the use of public transport as opposed to the car. 3.15 Leigh-on-Sea Railway Station is located to the east of the site and provides connections to Southend-on-Sea to the east and Basildon and Tilbury to the west. The services to the west also provide access into London. New strategic walking and cycling routes across the site can provide access 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
														Leigh-on-Sea Railway Station for new residents and also assist with improving access for existing residents in Hadleigh. 3.16 The site is therefore ideally located to encourage a shift to active travel modes and the use of public transport to reduce the reliance on the private car. Transport impact. 3.17 Any planning application for the site would be accompanied by a vision-led transport assessment that outlined and assessed the proposals in detail. This would include up-to-date background traffic survey data, details of all access proposals, forecasts for the walking, cycling, public transport and vehicle trips that the development could generate and a detailed assessment of the likely impacts on the A13 and other roads in the vicinity of the site. A sustainable travel plan would also be produced to identify a package										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 transport measures to encourage walking, cycling and public transport to and from the site. This will allow the local planning and highway authorities to assess the likely impact of the development on the local transport network. The Plan's approach to Green Belt sites. 3.18 The Hadleigh Estate (or 'South of Hadleigh / GB8) is noted at para. 13.10 of the Housing Capacity Statement as one of the 34 Green Belt sites 'identified for further consideration' for appraisal through the SLAA (discussed in detail below). Of these, the Topic Paper describes that 17 sites (part of 5 sites, and 12 'whole' sites) should 'continue to be considered further'. 3.19 The status in the context of Plan making of being 'considered further' is not clear. These 17 sites are not proposed allocations in the Regulation 19 Plan. It may be that 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					
												Council is anticipating scrutiny as to its proposed housing delivery at Examination stage and is holding these sites ‘in reserve’ in case they need to be relied upon. 3.20 In any event, South of Hadleigh’ (GB8) is not one of these 17 sites. The document indicates that this is because of conclusions reached in the Council’s Green Belt Assessment (2025), Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Outline Landscape Appraisal – Part 2 (2024) and a bespoke Heritage Impact Assessment relating to GB8. 3.21 The findings of these documents in so far as they relate to South of Hadleigh are inaccurate for the reasons described in detail below. It is important that at para. 14.3 of the Topic Paper, the Council identifies that if the 17 sites that should ‘continue to be considered further’ were allocated for development, the Plan’s shortfall															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required			
										against the Standard method housing supply figure would be 1,664. The Masterplan scheme for this site shows around 900 new homes being delivered, which would clearly make a very important contribution towards Castle Point's ability to meet its need, resulting in a shortfall of only around 700. 3.22 Whilst we cannot comment in detail of the suitability of these 17 sites that it appears may be brought into the Plan, we can comment on the appropriateness of bringing in this site and it is clear having reviewed the Council's evidence base, and the expert advice of consultants supporting the promotion of this land, that this should happen. Green Belt Assessment (July 2025). 3.23 Firstly, GB8 should be regarded as Grey Belt in the terms of the NPPF. 3.24 The Glossary to the Framework defines Grey belt as:														

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						
												'Land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development'. 3.25 In order therefore to constitute 'Grey belt' the land at South of Hadleigh must not 'strongly contribute' towards the following Green Belt purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 3.26 The Council's Green Belt Assessment cross refers to the Castle Point Borough Green Belt Review															

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required		
												part 1 (2018). That document has also been submitted as evidence in support of the Regulation 19 Plan. 3.27 The 2025 Assessment describes that the 2018 review ‘did not evaluate purpose d) (preserving historic settings) as it was not deemed applicable to the specific context of Castle Point’ (para.2.7.5). That remains the case, and so purpose d) of Para.143 of the Framework is not applicable to an assessment of whether South of Hadleigh should be regarded as Grey Belt. 3.28 The 2018 Review did however assess each [Green Belt] parcel [within Castle Point] individually ‘to determine its contribution’ to purpose a) and purpose b) (the remaining purposes relevant to an assessment of ‘Grey belt’). Paragraph 2.7.7 of the 2025 Assessment describes that the 2018 Review then ‘mapped out the cumulative contributions 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			
										each parcel...highlighting parcels with the highest overall significance to the Green Belt' (noting that the only remaining purposes being considered are a), b) and c). 3.29 The result of this exercise was the preparation of a Plan to show 'Locally Important Strategic Green Belt Areas' (below). 3.30 It should be noted that the site at South of Hadleigh (Parcel 15) is not identified as one of these areas, indicating that it is not considered to 'strongly contribute' to either purpose a) or purpose b). 3.31 The 2025 Green Belt Assessment then goes on to 'reassess' land within the 2018 parcels against the relevant paragraph 143 purposes, with the parcel boundaries redefined so that they align with the site boundaries of Green Belt sites that have been promoted for including in the Plan and called 'subareas'. 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			
													South of Hadleigh ‘subarea’ has the reference GB8 and its boundary is closely aligned with that of Parcel 15 of the 2018 Review. 3.32 The 2025 Assessment identifies that GB8 performs ‘moderately’ against purpose a) (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas). Whilst we do not agree with that assessment because we think that is an overstatement of the value of the land against that purpose, it is immaterial because if the subarea performs moderately as the Council says, it is not ‘strongly contributing’, which is the paragraph 143 Grey belt test. 3.33 That then only leaves purpose b). When considering purpose b) (preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another), the 2025 Assessment considers that GB8 performs strongly. That is in itself surprising, because the 2018 Review evidently dis not reach the same												

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required			
										conclusion (because the parcel was not a ‘Locally Important Green Belt Area’) and it is not clear what might have changed between then and now. 3.34 Explanation for this finding is provided at page 65 of the Appendices to the 2025 Assessment, where it is stated that: ‘Development of the sub-area would lead to the coalescence between Hadleigh and Leigh-On-Sea in this location. Although it is accepted that these built-up areas already merge directly to the north of the sub-area and the A13, the sub-area forms a substantial part of the remaining gap between Hadleigh and Leigh-On-Sea, the development of which would result in the loss of visual separation between towns’. 3.35 The Council has, respectfully, misdirected itself with its analysis of ‘the remaining gap’ and visual separation between towns’. Purpose b) is simply ‘to prevent														

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			
												neighbouring towns merging into one another’.																
												3.36 Hadleigh and Leigh and Sea are neighbouring towns that have long since merged into one another and so subarea GB8 makes no contribution to that purpose. The settlements have either merged or they have not merged – they cannot have ‘partially’ merged as the Council’s analysis seems to indicate. In this case. The experience for anybody travelling along the A13 is that they pass between two towns through continuous urban development because the towns are merged together – there is no ‘gap’ between them. Even if that Council’s approach to this assessment was correct, it cannot reasonably be the case that the site ‘strongly contributes’ to this purpose in these circumstances.																
												3.37 South of Hadleigh therefore does not contribute strongly to Paragraph 143 purposes a), b) or d), and it should 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					
												regarded as Grey Belt land. The Council should be treating this site like the 17 other sites that the Council refers in its Housing Capacity Study as for ‘further consideration’. That is particularly the case given that even if those 17 sites were allocated (and those sites in the current version of the Plan were robust in their ability to deliver the homes set out in the Plan period), there remains a large shortfall that the allocated of GB8 would significantly assist in addressing. Hadleigh Heritage Impact Assessment (June 2025). 3.38 The Council has commissioned a Heritage Impact Assessment relating to the site. This says that its analysis was based on the Vision Document for the site (at Appendix G) (as the Masterplan for the site had not been prepared at that time). Our Regulation 19 representations are supported by a Heritage Assessment of 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	
												site prepared by Cogent Heritage (Appendix E). 3.39 A summary table showing the respective positions on the potential level of 'harm' that could be caused to the various heritage assets at and around the site is set out in the table below. 3.40 There is some degree of difference between the Council's Impact Assessment and that prepared by Cogent Heritage, but the differences are not very significant. These are likely to be explained for the most part by that the Council's Report was based on the Vision Document (which has been significantly enhanced at Masterplan stage with regard the relationship with heritage assets) and that Place Services (who prepared the report for the Council) was not aware of the significant mitigation that is proposed as part of the Masterplan scheme, including substantial 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				
										of landscape buffer planting. 3.41 In fact, the Masterplan scheme would cause no harm to designated heritage assets at or around the site, and low levels of harm to two non-designated assets within proximity of the site. Heritage should be regarded as no impediment to the allocation of this site for development, subject to appropriate design mitigation being secured. Drafting within a site allocation policy, or the Council's 'Development Management' policy relating to heritage would secure this at planning application stage. Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Outline Landscape Appraisal (2024). 3.42 The Council's Landscape Sensitivity Assessment considers South of Hadleigh in two parcels. The eastern part of the site is referred to as 'GB8a' and the western part of the site is 'GB8b'. 3.43 Whilst 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	
												Assessment concludes that GB8b has a medium to low landscape sensitivity, it considers GB8a to have high landscape sensitivity. This is described as being because of views and the setting of Hadleigh Castle, existing vegetated field boundaries and open and long distance views across the estuary. 3.44 It is important to note that the authors of this Assessment will not have had sight of the Masterplan for the site, which has been developed in close collaboration with Aspect Landscape, as consultants to the project. A Landscape and Visual Technical Note is provided at Appendix D. 3.45 The Masterplan design has been carefully developed to include strategically positioned ‘viewing corridors’ (areas of open green space, providing views southwards through the site towards the Estuary). These, taken together with										

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required			
										extensive landscape buffer planting, would mitigate any harmful landscape impacts associated with developing the site. 3.50 We consider that the scoring displayed in the SLAA is quite arbitrary and difficult to understand. Had the criteria been scored more appropriately and transparently, the overall score would have been much nearer to the 'maximum' score of 82. 3.51 The SLAA concludes that it is unknown whether the site is developable or suitable. It clearly is both. It is also noteworthy that the density range shown for the site (between 1907 and 3179 units) is far higher than has been achieved through a detailed Master planning process, where a quantum of around 900 homes is shown. It is not clear where those much higher figures have arisen from or whether they have informed the scoring given to the site.														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1002-0004	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	SP3	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	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			Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		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. Perceived under-delivery of housing. Argues Site GB8 should have been allocated.	Consultation was re-started to address the procedural concern regarding two versions. <u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 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							
												(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 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																

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											prepared, the Castle Point Plan is not sound and it should be revisited, so as to include the allocation of land at Hadleigh.											
0337-0001	Organisation	Alex	Savine	Thurrock Council		SP3	Not Stated	Thurrock recognises the heavily constrained planning context that Castle Point Council contends with, being only 17 square miles in area and covered with numerous environmental designations including Ramsar Sites, Special Protection Areas, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Ancient Woodland and Flood Risk Zone 3b. The combined constraints map shows			At this stage we wish to reiterate that we are currently unable to confirm whether Thurrock Council can assist with meeting unmet housing need in Castle Point. As part of our work on the new Thurrock Local Plan 2024-2044, we are undertaking a review of our own Green Belt and Grey Belt areas within the Borough. In addition, we are mid-way through our own site assessment process to determine whether Thurrock has sufficient housing and employment land to meet its own needs. This process is anticipated to be complete early in 2026, and we welcome further discussion with Castle Point at that stage.					A	TC is currently working on its new Thurrock Local Plan 2024 – 2044 and is reviewing its Green Belt and Grey Belt areas as well as assessing sites to ascertain whether it can meet its own housing needs. Consequently, at this moment TC is unable to confirm whether it can assist CPBC in meeting its unmet housing need.	TC agrees that Castle Point faces notable physical and environment constraints to growth and TC has no objections to CPBC’s approach to addressing housing need. Both CPBC and TC agree to continue to work collaboratively through SEC to address CPBC and other authority areas’ unmet housing need within South Essex, while recognising the significant constraints that each of these authority areas face in meeting that need	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
								windfall sites. Thurrock Council do not wish to object to the Council's approach to addressing housing need within the Borough. We note that a design-based capacity assessment has been undertaken by Place Services to maximise density on the urban sites proposed for allocation within the Draft Plan.																
1442-0001	Individual	Wendy	Keith		Not Stated	SP3	Not Stated	No no no to the plans. We have so many homes already being built the island is getting two big with just one road. That's what you should do for the island is give us the	Not Stated									No to more homes on Canvey. Only one road access.		Noted. 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 Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex includes wider local improvements to transport		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
								second rd not more homes. We can't even get off the island for our hospital appointments or get anywhere cos you can't get off the island. So no we dont want no more homes .													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.			
1443-0001	Individual	Philip	Bostock		Not Stated	SP3	Not Stated	To suggest building 757 homes on every available car park and space in Hadleigh is plainly daft. No point saying that it's not been agreed. Even putting it forward is not sensible. If you are driven by dark forces or mental disturbance you need to get a grip, push back, act rationally.					There is open land east of Hadleigh, south of the A13. It's a poor place to put houses as it just adds to the congestion of the area. But it's still better than your 'plan'. But it's green belt. A million times better than the 'grey belt' car parks. Please try harder.						There is open land east of Hadleigh, south of the A13. It's a poor place to put houses as it just adds to the congestion of the area. But it's still better than your 'plan'. But it's green belt. A million times better than the 'grey belt' car parks.	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
1444-0001	Individual	Barbara	Parker			SP3	Not Stated	To whom it may concern, As a resident for 50 years in this area, I strongly object to the underhand methods by the current Labour Government changing designated 'Green Belt' to so called 'Grey Belt' areas. It is all part of the plan to weaken local views by putting parts of Essex together and delaying local elections. The Government expect the people of Essex to comply to their agenda and increase the population of this county against the wishes of it's residents. Our MP	Not Stated								To whom it may concern, As a resident for 50 years in this area, I strongly object to the underhand methods by the current Labour Government changing designated 'Green Belt' to so called 'Grey Belt' areas. It is all part of the plan to weaken local views by putting parts of Essex together and delaying local elections. The Government expect the people of Essex to comply to their agenda and increase the population of this county against the wishes of it's residents. Our MP Rebecca Harris is fighting this cause and I fully support her. If British citizens are having 1.41 children, additional housing is not necessary. It is a con and part of an irreversible plan if it is allowed to go ahead. It would change the county irreparably.		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
								Rebecca Harris is fighting this cause and I fully support her. If British citizens are having 1.41 children, additional housing is not necessary. It is a con and part of an irreversible plan if it is allowed to go ahead. It would change the county irreparably.														
1445-0001	Individual	Frances	Reading			SP3	No	That your plan is unsound and illegal we don't need more houses canvey is over populated now	No								That your plan is unsound and illegal we don't need more houses canvey is over populated now		Noted		N	
1446-0001	Individual	John	Butt			SP3	Not Stated	Canvey Island butchered again. Massive development with on infrastructure. Just as always. Canvey Island the dumping ground for	Not Stated								Canvey Island butchered again. Massive development with on infrastructure. Just as always. Canvey Island the dumping ground for what castle point does not want. Always has been since the formation of Castle point. I		Infrastructure: Infrastructure matters 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
								what castle point does not want. Always has been since the formation of Castle point. I have lived on Canvey Island [REDACTED] and watched it's destruction since castle point was formed.										have lived on Canvey Island [REDACTED] and watched it's destruction since castle point was formed.				
0243-0002	Individual	Jan	Payne		Not Stated	SP4	Not Stated		Not Stated	Not Stated	Firstly, all the infrastructure must be in place and a guarantee from the developers that all promised additions ie, GP surgeries, nurseries, improved junctions, affordable houses and assisted living for the elderly are delivered and not postponed at the last moment or take years to implement after the main development had been built. Secondly, Southend Hospital cannot cope at the moment. I have had personal experience of this, spending hours in an ambulance with			Not Stated	No	None	linfrastructure must be in place and a guarantee from the developers that all promised additions ie, GP surgeries, nurseries, improved junctions, affordable houses and assisted living for the elderly are delivered and not postponed at the last moment or take years to implement after the main development had been built. Southend Hospital cannot cope at the moment.	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters 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
												an elderly parent only to spend even longer in a corridor before finally being transferred to a ward. How will they cope when all these extra people are living in Castle Point? You must take into consideration the huge influx of residents that Southend B.C are expecting too. What are your intentions for dealing with the issue so that the hospital can cope and provide a safe environment that isn't detrimental to patients' health and wellbeing?									
0244-0002	Individual	Keith	Payne		Not Stated	SP4	Not Stated		Not Stated	Not Stated		All infrastructure must be put in place as building progresses.		Not Stated	No	None	All infrastructure must be put in place as building progresses.	Infrastructure Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).		N	
1013-0002	Organisation	Tessa	Saunders	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Yes	SP4	Yes		Yes			Anglian Water supports the policy requirement to demonstrate that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support development proposals, and that this capacity will be sustainable in both physical and financial terms. It is considered that this policy is consistent with Policy SD9 in terms		No	Not Answered		A	Anglian Water supports the policy requirement to demonstrate that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support development proposals, and that this capacity will be sustainable in both physical and financial terms. It is considered that	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
											of the need for proposals to demonstrate there is adequate foul water treatment and drainage infrastructure to serve the development.							this policy is consistent with Policy SD9 in terms of the need for proposals to demonstrate there is adequate foul water treatment and drainage infrastructure to serve the development.				
0284-0011	Organisation	Emma	Goodings	Brentwood Borough Council	Not Stated	SP4	Yes	BBC has no specific concerns over the soundness of this policy, or the wider infrastructure delivery strategy. BBC would, however, like to emphasise the importance of ensuring that the impacts of growth on key cross-boundary infrastructure including, schools, open spaces and healthcare services. This will require continued commitments to collaborative working,	Yes						No	A	No concerns over soundness of Developer Contributions policy	CPBC will continue to positively engage with the South Essex Councils through SEC and EPOA to ensure that the necessary infrastructure requirements are in place to support growth		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
								including through positive engagement between the Councils as a part of ASELA and the EPOA.															
0823-0003	Organisation	Pat	Abbott	Environment Agency	Yes	SP4	Yes		Yes		We are pleased to see that flood and water management is included in the list of infrastructure where developer contributions may be required. We welcome the proposal that s106 agreements and CIL charges could be used to fund flood infrastructure.We also welcome the statement that ‘[planning] permission [will] only granted if [there is a] demonstration of sufficient infrastructure capacity, including wastewater utility.’ It is important that wastewater provision is available to support growth and prevent environmental harm to the water environment.	We are pleased to see that flood and water management is included in the list of infrastructure where developer contributions may be required. We welcome the proposal that s106 agreements and CIL charges could be used to fund flood infrastructure. We also welcome the statement that ‘[planning] permission [will] only granted if [there is a] demonstration of sufficient infrastructure capacity, including wastewater utility.’ It is important that wastewater provision is available to support growth and prevent environmental harm to the water environment.	No	Not Answered		A	Supports policy SP4	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
0282-0005	Organisation	Kevin	Fraser	Essex County Council	Yes	SP4	No		No	Effective	As worded, Criteria 1 implies that contributions will only be made if the site is linked to an infrastructure item listed in the IDP. The IDP is a `living document' and will change over time as more information is known regarding particular site requirements. The purpose of the policy should be to ensure that all sites (including windfalls) make an appropriate contribution towards the necessary infrastructure consistent with the statutory tests in regulation 122 (as amended by the 2011 and 2019 Regulations), namely necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. ECC generally supports the policy as it has been adapted to suit local circumstances from the ECC modal policy on `Infrastructure		Criteria 1 is deleted The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies the infrastructure required to meet the demands of new development. Delete text for Criteria 2 and replace with: Where necessary, the Council will seek developers to make direct provision or provide proportionate contributions towards the provision of infrastructure required to make a development proposal acceptable in planning terms, in accordance with the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the provisions of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and having regard to the provisions of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Proposals for any development must demonstrate that the required infrastructure to support the development will be delivered in a timely, and where					The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a living document, and appropriate contributions are required if infrastructure needs relevant to any particular site have been identified. Further clarity is required to SP4 policy. Supports this policy, but greater clarity in criteria requiring that developers make direct provision and/or proportionate contributions towards infrastructure needs.	Accepted. Accepted and additional text added for clarity		1. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies the infrastructure required to meet the demands of new development. 2. Where necessary, the Council will seek developers to make direct provision or provide proportionate contributions towards the provision of infrastructure required to make a development proposal acceptable in planning terms, in accordance with the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the provisions of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and having regard to the provisions of the Infrastructure Delivery 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			
										Delivery and Impact Mitigation’, which has been included in other adopted Local Plans in Essex. For clarity, criteria 2 should make it clear that a development can be made acceptable in planning terms through direct provision and/or proportionate contributions rather than only contributions. This amendment would be consistent with Strategic Policy SP2, criteria 3a which states: • Provide or make a proportionate financial contribution to the delivery of necessary infrastructure alongside growth; And Policy Infra2, criteria 2 which states: 2. Where a development proposal, either individually or cumulatively, increases demand for education facilities beyond those available within the local area, development will be required to		appropriate, phased manner.												Proposals for any development must demonstrate that the required infrastructure to support the development will be delivered in a timely, and where appropriate, phased manner.

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												provide land for a new educational facility, expand or alter an existing facility and/or make a proportionate contribution to fund necessary improvements to education facilities.									
0341-0005	Organisation	Janet	Nuttal	Natural Engalnd		SP4	Yes	We welcome the inclusion of green and blue infrastructure (GI) in this policy.	Yes							A	We welcome the inclusion of green and blue infrastructure (GI) in this policy.	Support noted		N	
0338-0010	Organisation	Catherine	Bicknell	NHS Mid and South Essex		SP4	Yes	The ICB requested that healthcare infrastructure should be brought forward by new developments mitigating their impact recognising that the health system needs flexibility to spend contributions in the most appropriate way at the point that	Yes			Policy SP4 provides an adequate framework for negotiating development contributions. It should be noted that NHS Mid and South Essex will seek to secure investment through central capital funding, local resources and contributions through local authorities to invest in infrastructure that not only provides the primary care needs of growing and increasingly elderly populations but also for peoples' wider health and care				A	Policy SP4 provides an adequate framework for negotiating development contributions. It should be noted that NHS Mid and South Essex will seek to secure investment through central capital funding, local resources and contributions through local authorities to invest in infrastructure that not only provides the primary care needs of growing and increasingly elderly populations but also for peoples' wider health and care needs to be met through "left shift of care" into a community setting.	Policy SP4 provides an adequate framework for negotiating development contributions. It should be noted that NHS Mid and South Essex will seek to secure investment through central capital funding, local resources and contributions through local authorities to invest in infrastructure that not only provides the primary care needs of growing and increasingly elderly populations but also for peoples' wider health and care needs to be met through "left shift of care" into a community setting.		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
								Integrated Care Boards (ICBs) and wider NHS organisations to help them plan and manage their estates to unlock greater value and ensure every patient can get the care they need in the right place and space for them. NHSPS is part of the NHS and is wholly owned by the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) – all surplus funds are reinvested directly into the NHS to tackle the biggest estates challenges including space utilisation, quality, and access with the									health provision. As drafted Strategic Policy SP4 does not sufficiently reflect the engagement process required when assessing the likely level of healthcare infrastructure required to support the level of growth proposed by the plan. Supporting paragraph 6.64 stipulates the Council's consideration of the ECC Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions, and we also note the published Healthcare Facilities Developer Contributions Guidance SPD (2023). Whilst both documents set out the process/methodology adopted to determine the type of contributions, the required level of engagement with the Integrated Care Board (ICB) as local health commissioners should be made				

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	clear within Strategic Policy SP4, in line with Policy Infra3. For purposes of consistency across the Local Plan, we recommend the Council make clear reference to Policy Infra3 in seeking contributions for healthcare infrastructure, making clear reference unto the engagement required with the NHS and in particular, the ICB. Healthcare providers should have flexibility in determining the most appropriate means of meeting the relevant healthcare needs arising from a new development, and should therefore be engaged with at the earliest stages possible.				

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

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?		Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 the IDP (Supporting Paragraph 6.62). Policy Infra3 particularly concerns seeking planning obligations or CIL to mitigate impacts of new developments on health provision. As drafted Strategic Policy SP4 does not sufficiently reflect the engagement process required when assessing the likely level of healthcare infrastructure required to support the level of growth proposed by the plan. Supporting paragraph 6.64 stipulates the Council's consideration of 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

ECC Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions, and we also note the published Healthcare Facilities Developer Contributions Guidance SPD (2023). Whilst both documents set out the process/methodology adopted to determine the type of contributions, the required level of engagement with the Integrated Care Board (ICB) as local health commissioners should be made clear within Strategic Policy SP4, in line with Policy Infra3. For purposes of consistency

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why ?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0283-0009	Organisation	Emma	Goodings	Rochford District Council	Not Stated	SP4	Yes	Approach to Social Infrastructure and Community Facilities Policy SP4: RDC has no specific concerns over the soundness of this policy, or the wider infrastructure delivery strategy. RDC would, however, like to emphasise the importance of ensuring that the impacts of growth on key cross-boundary infrastructure including, schools, open spaces and healthcare services. This will require continued commitments to collaborative working, including through positive engagement between	Yes				Not Stated		No	A	Supports Policy. Refers to importance to collaborate to accommodate cross-boundary growth on shared infrastructure including schools, open space and healthcare	CPBC concurs that continued collaborative positive engagement between Councils as part of SEC and EPOA is important to successful plan-making of infrastructure to support growth.		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 Councils as a part of SEC and the EPOA.																
1440-0003	Organisation	Joseph	Beale	RSPB	Yes	SP4	Yes		No		There should be mention of developer RAMS contributions.		There should be mention of developer RAMS contributions.	No					There should be mention of developer RAMS contributions.		RAMs is covered by Policy ENV3(1b). However a cross reference can be added from the supporting text of SP4		New para 6.67 As set out in policy ENV3, developments may also be required to satisfy the requirements of the Habitats Regulations by making contributions as defined in the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) or by the provision of sustainable accessible natural greenspace (SANG) or SANG-like provision.	
0354-0002	Organisation	Mark	Sheppard	Southeast City Council		SP4	Not Stated	We will continue to work collaboratively with you in developing our respective Infrastructure Delivery Plans as	Not Stated	Not Stated	The policies for biodiversity and landscape are supported. We will continue to work with you to develop a Riverside Approach within our respective local plans that recognises the importance of the environmental,						A	SCC will continue to work collaboratively with CPBC in developing our respective Infrastructure Delivery Plans as there are many areas including transport, health, education, utilities and		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												
												there are many areas including transport, health, education, utilities and community facilities where our residents access services across administrative boundaries . We would welcome further dialogue in terms of transport planning.										social, cultural and economic role of the Thames Estuary foreshore and how it can best adapt to a changing climate.								community facilities where our residents access services across administrative boundaries. Would welcome further dialogue in terms of transport planning. The policies for biodiversity and landscape are supported. We will continue to work with you to develop a Riverside Approach within our respective local plans that recognises the importance of the environmental, social, cultural and economic role of the Thames Estuary foreshore and how it can best adapt to a changing climate.			
0738-0005	Organisation	Roy	Warren	Sport England	Yes	SP4	Yes		Yes			The policy is supported as it would help ensure that infrastructure requirements arising from development including facilities that support community sport and physical activity are provided to meet the additional demands created by new developments. The specific reference		No	Not Answered		A	The policy is supported as it would help ensure that infrastructure requirements arising from development including facilities that support community sport and physical activity are provided to meet the additional demands created by new developments.	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
											burden on existing residents.						unfair burden on existing residents.				
0274-0003	Organisation	Kit	Welch	Chelmsford City Council	Not Stated	Sustainable Development	Yes	CCC commends the Plan's place-led approach and its clear commitment to environmental stewardship, climate resilience, and nature recovery. We welcome the inclusion of Policies SD4 and SD5, which address both operational and embodied carbon, aligning with national net-zero ambitions. CCC also suggests strengthening delivery mechanisms for retrofit and energy efficiency in existing housing stock. CCC suggests exploring	Yes				Not Stated		No	A	We welcome the inclusion of Policies SD4 and SD5, which address both operational and embodied carbon, aligning with national net-zero ambitions. CCC also suggests strengthening delivery mechanisms for retrofit and energy efficiency in existing housing stock. CCC suggests exploring cross-boundary opportunities for climate adaptation infrastructure, especially in relation to water management and heat resilience. 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	Support for policies SD4 and SD5 noted and suggestion for exploring cross-boundary opportunities for climate adaptation 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
								cross-boundary opportunities for climate adaptation infrastructure, especially in relation to water management and heat resilience.									Essex Coast RAMS.				
0335-0004	Individual	Damen	Lynch	Planning Issues OBO Churchill Living and McCarthy Stone		Sustainable Development	No	The plan seeks to introduce a range of sustainable development measures including Net Zero Carbon Development (in operation and embodied carbon). Whilst Council's commitment to meeting both its and the UK Government's target of net zero carbon emissions is commendable, it appears that the Council is going to achieve	No	Justified, Effective	This approach is confirmed within the Ministerial Statement (statement no : Statement UIN HCWS123 available from Written statements - Written questions, answers and statements - UK Parliament) released on 13th December 2023. The ministerial statement confirms that with respect to the net zero goal...."The improvement in standards already in force, alongside the ones which are due in 2025, demonstrates the Government's commitment to ensuring new properties have a much lower impact on the environment in the future. In this context, the Government does not expect plan-makers to set local	We recommend that the following text is added to the draft policies SD4 and SD5 (Zero Carbon in operation and embodied carbon) to ensure it is justified and effective. "The council's viability assessments of specialist housing typologies has shown that these developments have limited viability and therefore such proposals will not be subject to these requirements. Instead, these proposals will meet building regulation requirements in place at the time".					"Specialist Housing for older people has a number of health benefits and proposals for such schemes will not be required to submit a Health Impact Assessment."	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		
								this through having mandatory carbon and climate standards from adoption of the plan that may go beyond government targets. However, it is our view that any requirement should be ‘stepped’ in line with Government targets and the proposed changes to the building regulations .				energy efficiency standards for buildings that go beyond current or planned buildings regulations. The proliferation of multiple, local standards by local authority area can add further costs to building new homes by adding complexity and undermining economies of scale. Any planning policies that propose local energy efficiency standards for buildings that go beyond current or planned buildings regulation should be rejected at examination if they do not have a well-reasoned and robustly costed rationale’ and ‘To be sound, local plans must be consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework and other statements of national planning policy, including this one.” We note that the council has commissioned a further viability													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?			First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name/Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
										study which looks at the impact of zero carbon policies and specifically examines sheltered housing. It concludes at 10.42 that: “We do note however that viability tends to be weaker in the lower value area and for certain types of scheme – flatted development, specialist older persons housing and single units, the latter 2 of which are only viable in the VA4. It is where some or all of these factors apply that the costs of meeting net zero carbon may mean that residential development becomes unviable when the additional costs are applied. This could mean that there may need to be an adjustment to land values to account for higher costs of development and/or a balance of policy considerations, unless other measures can be taken to improve viability.” We are therefore concerned that policies within this range have 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
													shown to be viable for older persons housing development within either of the viability studies undertaken by the council. This is particularly worrying given the identified housing needs for this typology. There is a danger that the requirements of the plan are unviable and the policies are not sufficiently flexible.										