

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0497-0002 | Individual | Jac kie | Hyd e | | Yes | Hou 5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0497-0003 | Individual | Jackie | Hyde | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 - 0002 | Individual | Joyce | Meadows | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0498 - 0003 | Individual | Joyce | Meadows | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0499-0002 | Individual | Doreen | Franklin | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0499 - 0003 | Individual | Doreen | Franklin | | Yes | For word | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 0500 - 0002 | Individual | Carol | Spicer | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0500 - 0003 | Individual | Carol | Spicer | | Yes | For word | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>(SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0501-0002 | Individual | George | Whitens | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0501 - 0003 | Individual | George | Whitens | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0502-0002 | Individual | Jean | Rooney | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0502-0003 | Individual | Jean | Rooney | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0503 - 0002 | Individual | Linda | Phillips | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0503 - 0003 | Individual | Linda | Phillips | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0504-0002 | Individual | Thomas | Cook | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0504 - 0003 | Individual | Thomas | Cook | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0505 - 0002 | Individual | Iris | Leonard | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0505 - 0003 | Individual | Iris | Leonard | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0506-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0506-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0506-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0507-0002 | Individual | Dennis | Huckle | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0507-0003 | Individual | Dennis | Huckle | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>(SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0508 - 0002 | Individual | Pat | Plant | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0508 - 0003 | Individual | Pat | Plant | | Yes | For word | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 0509-0002 | Individual | Julia | Silvester | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0509-0003 | Individual | Julia | Silvester | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0510-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0510-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0510-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 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 | 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 H031. 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 | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0511-0002 | Individual | John | Leonard | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0511-0003 | Individual | John | Leonard | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 0512-0002 | Individual | Ray | Clarke | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0512-0003 | Individual | Ray | Clarke | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | and reg 22 consultation statement. | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 - 0002 | Individual | Joan | Hill | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0513 - 0003 | Individual | Joan | Hill | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0514-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0514-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0514-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0515-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|---------------|
| 0515-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0515-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 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 | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 emergency evacuation procedures. 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 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. | | | | | | | therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle 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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>Where our Green Belt Review</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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. | |
| 0516-0002 | Individual | Carole | Malone | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | | | <p>included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt.</p> <p>That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0516-0003 | Individual | Carole | Malone | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them. | | | | | | | | |
| 0517-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0517-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0517-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0518 - 0002 | Individual | Martin | Rooney | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0518 - 0003 | Individual | Martin | Rooney | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>(SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0519-0002 | Individual | Brian | Crowhurst | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0519-0003 | Individual | Brian | Crowhurst | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0520 - 0002 | Individual | Dorothy | Panter | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0520 - 0003 | Individual | Dorothy | Panter | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0521-0002 | Individual | Edith | Olivier | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0521-0003 | Individual | Edith | Oliver | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | Firs t Na me | Last Na me | If orga nisat ion - nam e | Has agree d to publi catio n of Name /Com ment s? | Poli cy/ Par a No. | 2a. Leg ally Co mp lia nt? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. So un d? | 3b. Positive/Eff ective/Justif ied/Consist ent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wi sh to par ti ci pat e in ex am | 6. Wh y? | Sup porti ng Evid enc e sup plie d? | Opt ion A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Require d |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|------------------|----------------|
| 0522 - 0002 | Individual | Gle nda | Spo ner | | Yes | Hou 5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0522-0003 | Individual | Glenda | Sponsor | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|------------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 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 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 | 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 | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0523 - 0002 | Individual | Sandra | Gardner | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0523 - 0003 | Individual | Sandra | Gardner | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0524-0002 | Individual | Colin | Bates | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0524-0003 | Individual | Colin | Bates | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | Firs t Na me | Last Na me | If orga nisat ion - nam e | Has agree d to publi catio n of Name /Com ment s? | Poli cy/ Par a No. | 2a. Leg ally Co mp lia nt? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. So un d? | 3b. Positive/Eff ective/Justif ied/Consist ent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in ex am | 6. Wh y? | Sup porti ng Evid enc e sup plie d? | Opt ion A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Require d |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|------------------|----------------|
| 0525 - 0002 | Individual | Dee | Isbell | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0525-0003 | Individual | Dee | Isbell | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | Firs t Na me | Last Na me | If orga nisat ion - nam e | Has agree d to publi catio n of Name /Com ment s? | Poli cy/ Par a No. | 2a. Leg ally Co mp lia nt? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. So un d? | 3b. Positive/Eff ective/Justif ied/Consist ent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wi sh to par ti ci pa te in ex am | 6. Wh y? | Sup por ti ng Evid enc e sup plie d? | Opt ion A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Require d |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|----------------|
| 0526 - 0002 | Individual | Anne | Cook | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0526-0003 | Individual | Anne | Cook | | Yes | For word | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0527-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0527-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0527-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0528 - 0002 | Individual | Gina | Ridgwell | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0528-0003 | Individual | Gina | Ridgwell | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0529-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0529-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0529-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used 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.</p> <p>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,</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>Third Road The plan has been subject to detailed Transport</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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, 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/Age nt? | 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 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0530 - 0002 | Individual | Barbara | Lee | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt.</p> <p>That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0530-0003 | Individual | Barbara | Lee | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them. | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0531-0002 | Individual | Lynn | Hawkes | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0531-0003 | Individual | Lynn | Hawkes | | Yes | For word | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/ 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 |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0532 - 0002 | Individual | Christopher | Murphy | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0532-0003 | Individual | Christopher | Murphy | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0533 - 0002 | Individual | Pamela | Malley | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0533 - 0003 | Individual | Pamela | Malley | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</div> <div>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.</div> | |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0534-0002 | Individual | Jeanne | Rhodes | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0534-0003 | Individual | Jeanne | Rhodes | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0535-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0535-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0535-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0536 - 0002 | Individual | Ann | Godfrey | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0536-0003 | Individual | Ann | Godfrey | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 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 | 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 H031. 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 | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0537-0002 | Individual | Shirley | Hymas | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0537-0003 | Individual | Shirley | Hymas | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 - 0002 | Individual | Kathleen | Furnell | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0538 - 0003 | Individual | Kathleen | Furnell | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0539-0002 | Individual | Gary | Hawkes | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0539-0003 | Individual | Gary | Hawkes | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0540 - 0002 | Individual | Joyce | Kelly | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0540-0003 | Individual | Joyce | Kelly | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | Firs t Na me | Last Na me | If orga nisat ion - nam e | Has agree d to publi catio n of Name /Com ment s? | Poli cy/ Par a No. | 2a. Leg ally Co mp lia nt? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. So un d? | 3b. Positive/Eff ective/Justif ied/Consist ent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wi sh to par ti ci pat e in ex am | 6. Wh y? | Sup porti ng Evid enc e sup plie d? | Opt ion A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Require d |
|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|------------------|----------------|
| 0541-0002 | Individual | Jun e | Mal pas s | | Yes | Hou 5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0541-0003 | Individual | June | Malpas | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0542-0002 | Individual | Janet | Bear d | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0542-0003 | Individual | Janet | Bear d | | Yes | For eword | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0543 - 0002 | Individual | Joyce | Doughty | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0543 - 0003 | Individual | Joyce | Doughty | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0544-0002 | Individual | Jean | Preston | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0544 - 0003 | Individual | Jean | Preston | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0545 - 0002 | Individual | Jean | Baker | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0545-0003 | Individual | Jean | Baker | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0546-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0546-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0546-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | A | | | |

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

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

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | Firs t Na me | Last Na me | If orga nisat ion - nam e | Has agree d to publi catio n of Name /Com ment s? | Poli cy/ Par a No. | 2a. Leg ally Co mp lia nt? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. So un d? | 3b. Positive/Eff ective/Justif ied/Consist ent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wi sh to par ti ci pat e in ex am | 6. Wh y? | Sup porti ng Evid enc e sup plie d? | Opt ion A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Require d |
|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|------------------|----------------|
| 0547-0002 | Individual | Shirley | Walsh | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | Yes | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0547-0003 | Individual | Shirley | Walsh | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | Yes | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | proposal would not affect everybody's lives badly in Canvey Island – Benfleet area? | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0548 - 0002 | Individual | Susan | Phelps | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0548 - 0003 | Individual | Susan | Phelps | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0549-0002 | Individual | Jean | Cole | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0549 - 0003 | Individual | Jean | Cole | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0550 - 0002 | Individual | Fra ces | Pac kham | | Yes | Hou 5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0550 - 0003 | Individual | Fra ces | Pac kham | | Yes | For eword | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0551-0002 | Individual | Sharon | Colayir | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0551-0003 | Individual | Sharon | Colayir | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0552-0002 | Individual | Jani ce | McD onnell | | Yes | Hou 5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0552-0003 | Individual | Janice | McDonnell | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0553-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0553-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0553-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0554-0002 | Individual | Ivy | Fisher | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0554-0003 | Individual | Ivy | Fisher | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | Firs t Na me | Last Na me | If orga nisat ion - nam e | Has agree d to publi catio n of Name /Com ment s? | Poli cy/ Par a No. | 2a. Leg ally Co mp lia nt? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. So un d? | 3b. Positive/Eff ective/Justif ied/Consist ent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wi sh to par ti ci pat e in ex am | 6. Wh y? | Sup por ti ng Evid enc e sup plie d? | Opt ion A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Require d |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|----------------|
| 0555 - 0002 | Individual | Carol | Chambers | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0555 - 0003 | Individual | Carol | Chambers | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0556-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0556-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0556-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|------------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 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 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 | 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 H031. 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 | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0557-0002 | Individual | Linda | Conlon | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0557-0003 | Individual | Linda | Conlon | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0558-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0558-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0558-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0559-0002 | Individual | Terry | Williams | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0559-0003 | Individual | Terry | Williams | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|------------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 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 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 | 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 | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0560 - 0002 | Individual | Frances | Hammond | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0560 - 0003 | Individual | Frances | Hammond | | Yes | Foreword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0561-0002 | Individual | Sheila | Denham | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0561-0003 | Individual | Sheila | Denham | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | Firs t Na me | Last Na me | If orga nisat ion - nam e | Has agree d to publi catio n of Name /Com ment s? | Poli cy/ Par a No. | 2a. Leg ally Co mp lia nt? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. So un d? | 3b. Positive/Eff ective/Justif ied/Consist ent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wi sh to par ti ci pat e in ex am | 6. Wh y? | Sup por ti ng Evid enc e sup plie d? | Opt ion A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Require d |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|---|------------------|----------------|
| 0562 - 0002 | Individual | Ma ure en | Wag horn | | Yes | Hou 5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0562-0003 | Individual | Mareen | Waghorn | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 0563 - 0002 | Individual | Richard | May | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0563 - 0003 | Individual | Richard | May | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0564-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0564-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0564-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0565-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| 0565-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0565-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0566-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0566-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0566-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0567-0002 | Individual | Brenda | Spencer | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0567-0003 | Individual | Brenda | Spencer | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|------------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 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 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 | 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 | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0568 - 0002 | Individual | Barbara | Bennett | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0568 - 0003 | Individual | Barbara | Bennett | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0569-0002 | Individual | Marilyn | Cook | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0569-0003 | Individual | Marilyn | Cook | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0570-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0570-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0570-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 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 | 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 H031. 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 | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0571-0002 | Individual | Bernard | Chambers | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0571-0003 | Individual | Bernard | Chambers | | Yes | Foreword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0572-0002 | Individual | Susan | Dillon | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0572-0003 | Individual | Susan | Dillon | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0573 - 0002 | Individual | Susan | Tilley | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0573 - 0003 | Individual | Susan | Tilley | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 0574-0002 | Individual | Sharon | Porter | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0574-0003 | Individual | Sharon | Porter | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0575 - 0002 | Individual | James | Williams | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0575-0003 | Individual | Jam es | Willi s | | Yes | For eword | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0576-0002 | Individual | Cheryl | Taylor | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0576-0003 | Individual | Cheryl | Taylor | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0577-0002 | Individual | Debbie | Mcquade | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0577-0003 | Individual | Debbie | Mcquade | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 - 0002 | Individual | Joan | Billings | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0578 - 0003 | Individual | Joan | Billings | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0579-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0579-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0579-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0580 - 0002 | Individual | Valerie | Norris | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0580 - 0003 | Individual | Valerie | Norris | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0581-0002 | Individual | Raymond | Billings | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0581-0003 | Individual | Raymond | Billings | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0582-0002 | Individual | Sidney | Phelps | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0582-0003 | Individual | Sidney | Phelps | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0583 - 0002 | Individual | David | Tuggey | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0583 - 0003 | Individual | David | Tuggey | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>(SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 0584-0002 | Individual | Monica | Clark | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0584-0003 | Individual | Monica | Clark | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0585 - 0002 | Individual | Janet | Baker | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0585-0003 | Individual | Janet | Baker | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 0586 - 0002 | Individual | Sue | Byrne | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0586-0003 | Individual | Sue | Byrne | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | Firs t Na me | Last Na me | If orga nisat ion - nam e | Has agree d to publi catio n of Name /Com ment s? | Poli cy/ Par a No. | 2a. Leg ally Co mp lia nt? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. So un d? | 3b. Positive/Eff ective/Justif ied/Consist ent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in ex am | 6. Wh y? | Sup porti ng Evid enc e sup plie d? | Opt ion A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Require d |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|------------------|----------------|
| 0587 - 0002 | Individual | Vera | Allen | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0587-0003 | Individual | Vera | Allen | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0588-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0588-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0588-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|------------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 0589-0001 | Individual | Marion | Warner | | 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 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 | 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 | N |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0589-0002 | Individual | Marion | Warner | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0589-0003 | Individual | Marion | Warner | | Yes | For word | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0590 - 0002 | Individual | Julie | Hutton | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0590 - 0003 | Individual | Julie | Hutton | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>(SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 - 0002 | Individual | Shelley | Hull | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0591 - 0003 | Individual | Shelley | Hull | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0592-0002 | Individual | Alexandra | Webber | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0592-0003 | Individual | Alexandra | Webber | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0593-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0593-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0593-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0594-0002 | Individual | Gilligan | OConnor | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0594 - 0003 | Individual | Gillian | O'Connor | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 - 0002 | Individual | Rose | Cook | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0595-0003 | Individual | Rose | Cook | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 - 0002 | Individual | Michael | Hymas | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0596-0003 | Individual | Michael | Hymas | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0597-0002 | Individual | Ronald | Furnell | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0597-0003 | Individual | Ronald | Furnell | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0598 - 0002 | Individual | Hazel | Daniels | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0598 - 0003 | Individual | Hazel | Daniels | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 0599-0002 | Individual | Maureen | Vale | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0599 - 0003 | Individual | Mareen | Vale | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0600 - 0002 | Individual | Ann | Eldridge | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0600 - 0003 | Individual | Ann | Eldridge | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0601-0002 | Individual | Jenny | McQuade | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0601 - 0003 | Individual | Jenny | McQuade | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0602-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0602-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0602-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0603 - 0002 | Individual | Jenny | Lee | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0603 - 0003 | Individual | Jenny | Lee | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0604-0002 | Individual | Linda | Gibbs | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0604 - 0003 | Individual | Linda | Gibbs | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0605 - 0002 | Individual | Keith | Bear d | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0605 - 0003 | Individual | Keith | Bear d | | Yes | For eword | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0606-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0606-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0606-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0607-0002 | Individual | Doreen | Hunnabe | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0607-0003 | Individual | Doreen | Hunnablen | | Yes | For word | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0608 - 0002 | Individual | Sylvia | Sains | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0608 - 0003 | Individual | Sylvia | Sains | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0609-0002 | Individual | Lesley | Millis | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0609 - 0003 | Individual | Lesley | Mills | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0610-0002 | Individual | Joan | Pope | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0610-0003 | Individual | Joan | Pope | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0611-0002 | Individual | Linda | Gibson | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0611-0003 | Individual | Linda | Gibson | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| 0612-0002 | Individual | Linda | Cooper | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | <p>The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents</p> | <p>Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent</p> | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0612-0003 | Individual | Linda | Cooper | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/ 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <div>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</div> <div>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.</div> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0613 - 0002 | Individual | Linda | Coyte | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0613 - 0003 | Individual | Linda | Coyte | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

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

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

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

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>(SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| 0614-0002 | Individual | Susan | Hinton | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025). Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 Green Belt. That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes. Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0614-0003 | Individual | Susan | Hinton | | Yes | Forword | | | | | 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 0615-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0615-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0615-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0616-0001 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|---------------|
| 0616-0002 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0616-0003 | Removed as no permission given to publish. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 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 | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 emergency evacuation procedures. 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 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. | | | | | | | therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle 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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>Where our Green Belt Review</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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.</p> <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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. | |
| 0617-0002 | Individual | Rose | Malpas | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 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 allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | | | <p>included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt.</p> <p>That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0617-0003 | Individual | Rose | Malpas | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not have access to social media or the internet where the majority of the information on this matter has been published and the meetings were poorly advertised. The residents feel that they are discriminated against in | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them. | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | 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 | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | Firs t Na me | Last Na me | If orga nisat ion - nam e | Has agree d to publi catio n of Name /Com ment s? | Poli cy/ Par a No. | 2a. Leg ally Co mp lia nt? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. So un d? | 3b. Positive/Eff ective/Justif ied/Consist ent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wi sh to par tici pat e in ex am | 6. Wh y? | Sup porti ng Evid enc e sup plie d? | Opt ion A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Require d |
|--------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|--|----------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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 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. | | | | | | | we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle 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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>not preferred.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, 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.</p> <p>Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Emergency Evacuation The Councils detailed emergency planning pages are here www.castlepoint.gov.uk/emergencyplanning/</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|-------------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Local Transport Plan. | |
| 0618 - 0002 | Individual | Jean | Doolan | | Yes | Hou5 | | | | | The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what make the H031 site any different. Policy Hou5 states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but Hou5 | | | | | A | The plan allocates 173 homes at Thorney Bay so Kings Park should be allowed HOU5 should allow further development which improves the site environment for local residents | Thorny Bay The 173 homes at Thorney Bay are as a result of an existing planning permission and are not allocated as part of this Plan as they already have permission. They are however | 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents. | | | | | | | <p>included within the existing commitments. Full details of the 480 existing commitment can be found within the housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of the Housing Topic paper (August 2025).</p> <p>Kings Park Within the withdrawn local plan, the site adjacent to the eastern boundary of Kings Park was included as a housing allocation. However, that plan was withdrawn and that site remains within the extent of the Green Belt.</p> <p>That site was not promoted for consideration for inclusion within the Castle Point Plan, and is not therefore available for development purposes.</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Separately, it has been identified through the Open Space Assessment and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy as a potential site for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain which the landowner intends to bring forward. | |
| 0618-0003 | Individual | Jean | Doolan | | Yes | Forward | | | | | I would like to introduce myself as Chair of the Kings Park Village Residents Association. Our committee have recently been: inundated with enquiries from residents asking how they can object to the building of 3,316 homes in Canvey Island and emphasise the need for a third road off the island. As you must be aware we are a retirement park, and as such many of our residents do not 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 | | | | | A | Kings Park residents feel discriminated against during the consultation as they do not have access to the internet and felt events were poorly advertised. | Comments noted. The council has prioritised inclusivity for the consultations. Further details of this is included in the reg 18 consultation statement and reg 22 consultation statement. | N |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | that they are limited in having a say in these matters and the committee are in agreement with them. | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | 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 | 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 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 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. | | | | | | | we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle 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 | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Agent? | First Name | Last Name | If organisation - name | Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments? | Policy/Para No. | 2a. Legally Compliant? | 2b. If No, explanation | 3a. Sound? | 3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent? | 3c. Explanation | 4. Suggested modifications | 5. Wish to participate in exam | 6. Why? | Supporting Evidence supplied? | Option A, B or C | Summary | Officer Response | Mods Required |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>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</p> | |

| ID Ref | Individual/Organisation/Age nt? | 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>not preferred.</p> <p>Consideration of All Sites All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>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</p> | |