

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1252-0002	Individual	Anastasia	Power			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1252-0003	Individual	Anastasia	Power			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1253-0001	Individual	Brian	Thomas			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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>Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.</p>	
1253-0002	Individual	Brian	Thomas			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1253-0003	Individual	Brian	Thomas			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1254-0001	Individual	Edwin	Ford			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1254-0002	Individual	Edwin	Ford			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1254-0003	Individual	Edwin	Ford			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1255-0001	Individual	Linda	Claydon			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1255-0002	Individual	Linda	Claydon			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1255-0003	Individual	Linda	Claydon			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1256-0001	Individual	Pamela	Warren			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1256-0002	Individual	Pamela	Warren			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1256-0003	Individual	Pamela	Warren			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1257-0001	Individual	John	Hill			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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
																		Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1257-0002	Individual	John	Hill			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1257-0003	Individual	John	Hill			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1258-0001	Individual	Susan	Laurie			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1258-0002	Individual	Susan	Laurie			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1258-0003	Individual	Susan	Laurie			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1259-0001	Individual	Eric	Burnham			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard</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
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1259-0002	Individual	Eric	Burnham			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1259-0003	Individual	Eric	Burnham			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1260-0001	Individual	Janice	Dawkins			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1260-0002	Individual	Janice	Dawkins			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1260-0003	Individual	Janice	Dawkins			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1261-0001	Individual	Jean	Hagger			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u></p> <p>Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u></p> <p>Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u></p> <p>Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.</p>	
1261-0002	Individual	Jean	Hagger			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1261-0003	Individual	Jean	Hagger			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1262-0001	Individual	Patricia	Ruff			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
126 2-000 2	Individual	Patricia	Ruff			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
126 2-000 3	Individual	Patricia	Ruff			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
126 3-000 1	Individual	Marilyn	Hellier			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1263-0002	Individual	Marilyn	Hellcar			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1263-0003	Individual	Marilyn	Hellcar			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1264-0001	Individual	Jac kie	Bro wn			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1264-0002	Individual	Jac kie	Bro wn			Hou 5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1264-0003	Individual	Jackie	Brown			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1265-0001	Individual	Peter	Hosier			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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>Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.</p>	
1265-0002	Individual	Peter	Hosier			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1265-0003	Individual	Peter	Hosier			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1266-0001	Individual	Paul	Scott			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1266-0002	Individual	Paul	Scott			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1266-0003	Individual	Paul	Scott			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1267-0001	Individual	Gwendolyn	Gatrell			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard</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
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1267-0002	Individual	Gwendal	Gatrell			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1267-0003	Individual	Gwendal	Gatrell			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1268-0001	Individual	June	Hooper			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1268-0002	Individual	June	Hooper			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1268-0003	Individual	June	Hooper			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1269-0001	Individual	Teresa	Barvick			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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
																		Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1269-0002	Individual	Teresa	Barvick			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1269-0003	Individual	Teresa	Barvick			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1270-0001	Individual	Thomas	McCloughan			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1270-0002	Individual	Thomas	McClennaghan			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1270-0003	Individual	Thomas	McClennaghan			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1271-0001	Individual	Norma	Reis			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1271-0002	Individual	Norma	Reis			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1271-0003	Individual	Norma	Reis			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1272-0001	Individual	Steven	Low e			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1272-0002	Individual	Steven	Low			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
127 2-000 3	Individual	Steven	Lowe			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
127 3-000 1	Individual	Anthony	Smith			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.</p>	
1273-0002	Individual	Anthony	Smith			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1273-0003	Individual	Anthony	Smith			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1274-0001	Individual	Theresa	Grant			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1274-0002	Individual	Theresa	Grant			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1274-0003	Individual	Theresa	Grant			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1275-0001	Individual	Kim	Rawling			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1275-0002	Individual	Kim	Rawling			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1275-0003	Individual	Kim	Rawling			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1276-0001	Individual	Roger	Sains			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1276-0002	Individual	Roger	Sains			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1276-0003	Individual	Roger	Sains			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1277-0001	Individual	Linda	Tebb			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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>Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u></p> <p>Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u></p> <p>Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u></p> <p>Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.</p>	
1277-0002	Individual	Linda	Tebb			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1277-0003	Individual	Linda	Tebb			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1278-0001	Individual	Peter	Reed			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1278-0002	Individual	Peter	Reed			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1278-0003	Individual	Peter	Reed			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1279-0001	Individual	Alan	Pricer			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard</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
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1279-0002	Individual	Alan	Price			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1279-0003	Individual	Alan	Price			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1280-0001	Individual	Lesley	Taylor			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1280-0002	Individual	Lesley	Taylor			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1280-0003	Individual	Lesley	Taylor			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1281-0001	Individual	Jean	Davies			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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>Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u></p> <p>Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u></p> <p>Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u></p> <p>Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.</p>	
1281-0002	Individual	Jean	Davies			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
128 1-000 3	Individual	Jean	Davies			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
128 2-000 1	Individual	Barbara	Letch			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
128 2-000 2	Individual	Barbara	Letch			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
128 2-000 3	Individual	Barbara	Letch			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
128 3-000 1	Individual	Dawn	Young			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard</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
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1283-0002	Individual	Dawn	Young			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1283-0003	Individual	Dawn	Young			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1284-0001	Individual	Raymond	OCallaghan			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1284-0002	Individual	Raymond	OCallaghan			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
128 4-000 3	Individual	Raymond	OCa llaghan			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
128 5-000 1	Individual	Joan	OCa llaghan			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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
																		Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1285-0002	Individual	Joan	OCallaghan			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
128 5-000 3	Individual	Joan	OCallaghan			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
128 6-000 1	Individual	John	Hammond			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
128 6-000 2	Individual	John	Hammond			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
128 6-000 3	Individual	John	Hammond			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
128 7-000 1	Individual	Mr AJ	Taylor			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard</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
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1287-0002	Individual	Mr AJ	Taylor			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1287-0003	Individual	Mr AJ	Taylor			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1288-0001	Individual	Mrs AJ	Taylor			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<p><u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting</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
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1288-0002	Individual	Mrs AJ	Taylor			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
128-8-0003	Individual	Mrs AJ	Taylor			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
128-9-0001	Individual	Anita	Shean			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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>Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u></p> <p>Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u></p> <p>Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u></p> <p>Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.</p>	
1289-0002	Individual	Anita	Shean			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1289-0003	Individual	Anita	Shean			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1290-0001	Individual	John	Shean			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.</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
1290-0002	Individual	John	Shean			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1290-0003	Individual	John	Shean			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1291-0001	Individual	Albert	Leatham			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard</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
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1291-0002	Individual	Albert	Leatham			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1291-0003	Individual	Albert	Leatham			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1292-0001	Individual	Stephen	Fox			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1292-0002	Individual	Stephen	Fox			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
129 2-000 3	Individual	Stephen	Fox			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
129 3-000 1	Individual	Sylvia	Fox			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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>Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.</p>	
1293-0002	Individual	Sylvia	Fox			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1293-0003	Individual	Sylvia	Fox			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1294-0001	Individual	Linda	Freeman			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1294-0002	Individual	Linda	Freeman			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1294-0003	Individual	Linda	Freeman			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1295-0001	Individual	James	Gray			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p><u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p><u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard</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
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1295-0002	Individual	James	Gray			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1295-0003	Individual	James	Gray			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1296-0001	Individual	Anthony	Johnson			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1296-0002	Individual	Anthony	Johnson			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
129 6-000 3	Individual	Anthony	Johnson			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
129 7-000 1	Individual	Patrick	Gardiner			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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
																		Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1297-0002	Individual	Patrick	Gardiner			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1297-0003	Individual	Patrick	Gardiner			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1298-0001	Individual	Joan	McClulloch			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1298-0002	Individual	Joan	McCulloch			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1298-0003	Individual	Joan	McCulloch			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1299-0001	Individual	Eileen	Janes			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	



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 und?	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
																		ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1299-0002	Individual	Eileen	Jane			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1299-0003	Individual	Eileen	Jane			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1300-0001	Individual	Susan	Bass			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	<u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1300-0002	Individual	Susan	Bass			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1300-0003	Individual	Susan	Bass			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1301-0001	Individual	Christine	Eagles			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led</p>	<p>Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West</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
																		Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1301-0002	Individual	Christine	Eagles			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust,									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.											
1301-0003	Individual	Christine	Eagles			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1302-0001	Individual	June	Marsden			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding,	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1302-0002	Individual	June	Martinson			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1302-0003	Individual	June	Martinson			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1303-0001	Individual	Brian	Martinson			SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration	Y - See Schedule of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastructure and Sustainable Development (including SuDS)

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.			sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1303-0002	Individual	Brian	Martinson			Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1303-0003	Individual	Brian	Martinson			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/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
130 4-000 1	Individual	Ian	King		Yes	Wh ole Pla n	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Plan to be legally compliant.	Ye s		I consider the Draft Plan to be Sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
130 5-000 1	Individual	Lyn da	King		Yes	Wh ole Pla n	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Plan to be legally compliant.	Ye s		I consider the Draft Plan to be Sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
130 6-000 1	Individual	Ann e	Well s		Yes	Wh ole Pla n	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Plan to be legally compliant.	Ye s		I consider the Draft Plan to be Sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
130 7-000 1	ERROR																		
130 8-000 1	Individual	Mic hae l	Ford		Yes	SP3	No	This is the response from Kings Park Residents Association on behalf of the 149 residents who have signed the accompanying forms, and the 75 residents who have signed the enclosed letters, in response to the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft consultation, as reopened 24th October 2025 and closing 5th December 2025. Policy reference/name: Hou5 Page number: 92 Paragraph number: 13.43-13.46 We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	We consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at					Plan is unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing	Y - See Schedul e of Mods, in relation to Canvey, Infrastru cture and Sustaina ble Develop ment (includi ng SuDS)	



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led						all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure , the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led	than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025. <u>Consideration of All Sites</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). <u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments. <u>Flooding</u> Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>SUDs</u> Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1308-0002	Individual	Michael	Ford		Yes	Hou5		The plan has included Thorney Bay development for 173 homes, so what makes the HO31 site any different. The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All of our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.									Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1308-0003	Individual	Michael	Ford		Yes	C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures.						Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1309-0001	Individual	Kay	Pumfrey			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b>  3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex <b>and the Castle Point</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see	<b>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with 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
																		requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), including in relation to Canvey.</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
																		SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1309-0002	Individual	Kay	Pumfrey			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1309-0003	Individual	Kay	Pumfrey			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1310-0001	Individual	L	West			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N
1310-0002	Individual	L	West			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b>  3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											homes for Canvey is not resident led.							five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle 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	network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex <b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year 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>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence.</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>Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</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</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
																		assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.</p>	
1310-0003	Individual	L	West			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1311-	Individual	Dorothy	Panter			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not	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
0001											Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.						improved site environment for the local residents	restrict improvement to the sites environment	
1311-0002	Individual	Dorothy	Panter			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle 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	Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>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>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was</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>not preferred.</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 in providing flood mitigation,</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>Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk</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
																		covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1311-0003	Individual	Dorothy	Panter			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1312-0001	Individual	Vickey	Starkey			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1312-0002	Individual	Vic key	Star key			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1312-0003	Individual	Vicky	Starkey			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1313-0001	Individual	Alan	West			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1313-0002	Individual	Alan	West			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1313-0003	Individual	Alan	West			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1314-0001	Individual	Graham	Titheradge			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1314-0002	Individual	Graham	Titheradge			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1314-0003	Individual	Graham	Titheradge			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1315-0001	Individual	Mrs J	Titheradge			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1315-0002	Individual	Mrs J	Titheradge			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1315-0003	Individual	Mrs J	Titheradge			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1316-0001	Individual	Valerie	Hawkins			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1316-0002	Individual	Valerie	Hawkins			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1316-0003	Individual	Valerie	Hawkins			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1317-0001	Individual	John	Hawkins			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1317-0002	Individual	John	Hawkins			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1317-0003	Individual	John	Hawkins			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1318-0001	Individual	Leonara	Mallake			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1318-0002	Individual	Leonara	Mallake			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1318-0003	Individual	Leonara	Mallake			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1319-0001	Individual	Janet	Almond			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1319-0002	Individual	Janet	Almond			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1319-0003	Individual	Janet	Almond			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1320-0001	Individual	M	Glover			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1320-0002	Individual	M	Glover			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1320-0003	Individual	M	Glover			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1321-0001	Individual	J	Glover			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1321-0002	Individual	J	Glover			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1321-0003	Individual	J	Glover			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1322-0001	Individual	Reg	Baker			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1322-0002	Individual	Reg	Baker			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1322-0003	Individual	Reg	Baker			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1323-0001	Individual	Christine	Bentham			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1323-0002	Individual	Christine	Bentham			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1323-0003	Individual	Christine	Bentham			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1324-0001	Individual	Irene	Sambrook			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1324-0002	Individual	Irene	Sambrook			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1324-0003	Individual	Irene	Sambrook			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1325-0001	Individual	Julie	Hicks			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1325-0002	Individual	Julie	Hicks			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1325-0003	Individual	Julie	Hicks			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1326-0001	Individual	Brian	Hicks			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1326-0002	Individual	Brian	Hicks			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1326-0003	Individual	Brian	Hicks			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1327-0001	Individual	Sharon	Porter			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1327-0002	Individual	Sharon	Porter			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1327-0003	Individual	Sharon	Porter			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1328-0001	Individual	Shelley	Hull			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1328-0002	Individual	Shelley	Hull			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1328-0003	Individual	Shelley	Hull			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1329-0001	Individual	Terry	Wildman			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1329-0002	Individual	Terry	Wildman			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1329-0003	Individual	Terry	Wildman			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1330-0001	Individual	Brenda	Tanner			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1330-0002	Individual	Brenda	Tanner			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1330-0003	Individual	Brenda	Tanner			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1331-0001	Individual	Mrs L	Coyte			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1331-0002	Individual	Mrs L	Coyte			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1331-0003	Individual	Mrs L	Coyte			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1332-0001	Individual	S	Byrne			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1332-0002	Individual	S	Byrne			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
133 2-000 3	Individual	S	Byrne			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
133 3-000 1	Individual	S	Clarke			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1333-0002	Individual	S	Clarke			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1333-0003	Individual	S	Clarke			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1334-0001	Individual	Pam	Malley			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1334-0002	Individual	Pam	Malley			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1334-0003	Individual	Pam	Malley			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1335-0001	Individual	Jame	Willis			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1335-0002	Individual	Jame	Willis			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1335-0003	Individual	Jame	Willis			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1336-0001	Individual	Julie	Hutton			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1336-0002	Individual	Julie	Hutton			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1336-0003	Individual	Julie	Hutton			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1337-0001	Individual	Joyce	Doughty			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1337-0002	Individual	Joyce	Doughty			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1337-0003	Individual	Joyce	Doughty			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1338-0001	Individual	Steve	Hutton			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1338-0002	Individual	Steve	Hutton			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1338-0003	Individual	Steve	Hutton			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1339-0001	Individual	Janet	Mitchell			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1339-0002	Individual	Janet	Mitchell			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1339-0003	Individual	Janet	Mitchell			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1340-0001	Individual	Ivy	Fisher			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1340-0002	Individual	Ivy	Fisher			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1340-0003	Individual	Ivy	Fisher			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1341-0001	Individual	D	Huckle			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1341-0002	Individual	D	Huckle			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b>  3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1341-0003	Individual	D	Huckle			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1342-0001	Individual	Larry	Coyte			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1342-0002	Individual	Larry	Coyte			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1342-0003	Individual	Larry	Coyte			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1343-0001	Individual	Beryl	Stewart			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1343-0002	Individual	Beryl	Stewart			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1343-0003	Individual	Beryl	Stewart			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1344-0001	Individual	Tracy	Duffosse			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1344-0002	Individual	Tracy	Duffosse			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1344-0003	Individual	Tracy	Dufosse			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1345-0001	Individual	Linda	Cooper			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1345-0002	Individual	Linda	Cooper			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1345-0003	Individual	Linda	Cooper			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1346-0001	Individual	Christopher	Murphy			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1346-0002	Individual	Christopher	Murphy			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

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 und?	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
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1346-0003	Individual	Christopher	Murphy			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1347-0001	Individual	Marie	Stephenson			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1347-0002	Individual	Marie	Stephenson			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1347-0003	Individual	Marie	Stephenson			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1348-0001	Individual	J	Milton			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1348-0002	Individual	J	Milton			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1348-0003	Individual	J	Milton			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1349-0001	Individual	D	Tuggey			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1349-0002	Individual	D	Tuggey			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1349-0003	Individual	D	Tuggey			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1350-0001	Individual	Joy	Baker			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1350-0002	Individual	Joy	Baker			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1350-0003	Individual	Joy	Baker			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1351-0001	Individual	J	Malpas			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1351-0002	Individual	J	Malpas			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1351-0003	Individual	J	Malpass			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1352-0001	Individual	Mrs VM	Allen			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1352-0002	Individual	Mrs VM	Allen			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
135 2-000 3	Individual	Mrs VM	Allen			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
135 3-000 1	Individual	June	Moxhay			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1353-0002	Individual	June	Moxhay			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1353-0003	Individual	June	Moxhay			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1354-0001	Individual	Martin	English			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1354-0002	Individual	Martin	English			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1354-0003	Individual	Martin	English			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1355-0001	Individual	Doreen	Hunnable			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1355-0002	Individual	Doreen	Hunnablen			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1355-0003	Individual	Doreen	Hunnable			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1356-0001	Individual	Julie	Cashman			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1356-0002	Individual	Julie	Cashman			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1356-0003	Individual	Julie	Cashman			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1357-0001	Individual	Ian	Grimsey			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1357-0002	Individual	Ian	Grimsey			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1357-0003	Individual	Ian	Grimsey			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1358-0001	Individual	Linda	Conlon			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1358-0002	Individual	Linda	Conlon			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1358-0003	Individual	Linda	Conlon			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1359-0001	Individual	Francis	Hammond			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1359-0002	Individual	Francis	Hammond			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1359-0003	Individual	Francis	Hammond			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1360-0001	Individual	Jean	Cole			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1360-0002	Individual	Jean	Cole			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1360-0003	Individual	Jean	Cole			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1361-0001	Individual	S	Rabey			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1361-0002	Individual	S	Rabey			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
136 1-000 3	Individual	S	Rabey			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
136 2-000 1	Individual	Christine	Le-May			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
136 2-000 3	Individual	Christine	Le-May			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
136 3-000 1	Individual	Linda	Godley			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N





ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1363-0003	Individual	Linda	Godley			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1364-0001	Individual	Wendy	Edwards			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1364-0002	Individual	Wendy	Edwards			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b>  3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1364-0003	Individual	Wendy	Edwards			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1365-0001	Individual	Jane	Grimmer			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1365-0002	Individual	Jan e	Gri mmer			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1365-0003	Individual	Jane	Grimmer			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1366-0001	Individual	Norman	Warren			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1366-0002	Individual	Norman	War n			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1366-0003	Individual	Norman	Warren			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1367-0001	Individual	Patricia	Carswell			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1367-0002	Individual	Patricia	Carswell			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1367-0003	Individual	Patricia	Carswell			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1368-0001	Individual	Steven	Tilley			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>





ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1368-0003	Individual	Steven	Tilley			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1369-0001	Individual	Terry	Wood			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1369-0002	Individual	Terry	Wood			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1369-0003	Individual	Terry	Wood			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1370-0001	Individual	Susan	Tilley			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

















ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1371-0003	Individual	Barbara	Harmer			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1372-0001	Individual	Maureen	Vale			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1372-0002	Individual	Mareen	Vale			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1372-0003	Individual	Mareen	Vale			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1373-0001	Individual	Patricia	Baker			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1373-0002	Individual	Patricia	Baker			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1373-0003	Individual	Patricia	Baker			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1374-0001	Individual	Monica	Clark			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1374-0003	Individual	Monica	Clark			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1375-0001	Individual	Rosemary	Grimsey			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1375-0002	Individual	Rosemary	Grimsey			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1375-0003	Individual	Rosemary	Grimsey			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1376-0001	Individual	Janet	Dinaline			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1376-0002	Individual	Janet	Dina line			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1376-0003	Individual	Janet	Dina line			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1377-0001	Individual	Sharon	Moran			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1377-0003	Individual	Sharon	Moran			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1378-0001	Individual	Philip	Moran			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N







ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the	



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1378-0003	Individual	Philip	Moran			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1379-0001	Individual	Ann	Eldridge			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N





ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1379-0003	Individual	Ann	Eldridge			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1380-0001	Individual	Mrs V	Norris			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1380-0002	Individual	Mrs V	Norris			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1380-0003	Individual	Mrs V	Norris			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1381-0001	Individual	Mrs F	Pacham			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1381-0002	Individual	Mrs F	Packham			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1381-0003	Individual	Mrs F	Packham			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1382-0001	Individual	John	Tanner			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1382-0002	Individual	John	Tanner			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
138 2-000 3	Individual	John	Tanner			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
138 3-000 1	Individual	Janet	Baker			Hou 5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1383-0002	Individual	Janet	Baker			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1383-0003	Individual	Janet	Baker			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1384-0001	Individual	S	Dillon			Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which		No				Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to the sites environment	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											improves the overall site environment for the local residents.								
1384-0002	Individual	S	Dillon			SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley should have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure.	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will	Y - <b>Policy SD3(3)</b> 3. Proposals must demonstrate how the SuDS feature(s) reflect and respond to the site circumstances, landscape character and the green-blue infrastructure network, and have regard to Essex County Council's SuDS Design Guide for Essex

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards.	<b>and the Castle Point Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</b>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>For further information please see housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt</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
																		Review in accordance with the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of 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>impact of the Green Belt sites that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2. Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.</p> <p>Flooding Flood risk covered in policies and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),</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
																		including in relation to Canvey. SUDs Policy SD3 covers SuDs and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1384-0003	Individual	S	Dillon			C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures		No				Development at West Canvey will impact emergency evacuation procedures for those residents living at East Canvey	The safety of all Castle Point residents is a priority and has been considered within the Castle Point Plan	N
1385-0001	Individual	Sheila	Turnbull		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound. Reference No 25/0778/OUT I am most dissatisfied about the 165 dwellings as this could produce an extra 300 cars to use the already saturated glebelands, Rushbottom Lane and a						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant, Concered about a planning application on Glebelands	Support Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											bottle neck at Tarpots - Schools - Drs Surgery at breaking point.								
1386-0001	Individual	Colin	Sullivan		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound. Plan 25/0778/OUT Strongly object to above plan, would cause chaos in area where schools and doctors surgery filled to capacity. This does not take into consideration peoples homes which will be ruined by deliveries of building products being taken to site during days. This plan has been refused before and nothing has changed.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant, Concered about a planning application on Glebelands	Support Noted	N
1387-0001	Individual	Pauline	Everett		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1388-0001	Individual	Keith	Skiner		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1389-0001	Individual	Louisa	Skiner		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1390-0001	Individual	Connor	Hughes		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1391-0001	Individual	Eileen	Gilbert		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1392-0001	Individual	Bridgett	Bloss		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	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
139 3-000 1	Individual	Ronald	Bloss		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
139 4-000 1	Individual	Joyce	White		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
139 5-000 1	Individual	David	Regan		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
139 6-000 1	Individual	Mr Peter	Robbins		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
139 7-000 1	Individual	Mrs Peter	Robbins		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
139 8-000 1	Individual	Keith	Barker		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
139 9-000 1	Individual	James	Collins		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
140 0-000 1	Individual	Raymond	Fisher		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
140 1-000 1	Individual	Ian	Lyns		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
140 2-000 1	Individual	Gaynor	Law		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
140 3-	Individual	Raymond	Law		Yes	Whole	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0001						Plan		I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant											
1404-0001	Individual	Pat	Thomas		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1405-0001	Individual	Marjorie	Hill		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound. I have lived at the above address for the last 55 years. The Drs was where williams opticians was before now. As you mentioned it isa a nightmare to even get a Drs appointment now and to get in and out clare road is a nightmare as no one will give way to you. We have 2 or 3 houses built end of Ivy Road and when we got to end of the road we kept being met with builders lorries so we couldnt get into Wycombe Ave let alone Clare as they have had Buildier working on the corner as well.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant, Concerns around health infrastructure and road network capacity when shared with vehicles associated with Building work	Support Noted	N
1406-0001	Individual	Linda	Warham		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound. Glebelands 25/0779/Out I do not support the Glebelands plan above as I don't think the infrastructure has been thoroughly thought out there are many reasons to think about. 1) Schools 2) Doctors 3) Shops 4) Traffic at Sadlers farm roundabout, London Road,						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant, Conerned about Glebelands planning appliation and raises some points for refusal.	Support Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											clare Road, Tarpots, it's already gridlocked in School times and the rush hour 5) Water and Sewerage drains would be under more pressure than they already are we have had several water and sewerage leaks over the past year. They only got patched up instead of replacing the whole lots. 6) Pavements are terrible they area trip hazard for everyone. 7) The council can't keep up with things now so what will happen then. 8) Whilst building this development would cause absolute chaos.									
1407-0001	Individual	Diane	James		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N	
1408-0001	Individual	George	Cripps		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N	
1409-0001	Individual	Andrew	Summers		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes		Yes								Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N	
1410-0001	Individual	Glenis	Summers		Yes	Whole Plan	Not Stated		Yes								Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N	
1411-0001	<b>ERROR</b>																			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1412-0001	Individual	Megan	Stone		Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site.	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1 050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11 ,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It	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
																		should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with</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
																		the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. 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
																		that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2.  Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.	
1412-0002	Individual	Megan	Stone		Yes	Had 2	Not Stated	I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar	Not Stated		I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing	We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.	No				Support for policy HAD2 but concern that the plan for over 6000 homes puts this site at risk for speculative development	Support noted.  Should the plan be adopted this will safeguard from speculative development.	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt.			planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction.								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1413-0001	Individual	Beryl	Disney		Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site.	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1 050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11 ,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It	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
																		should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		<p>housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with</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
																		the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. 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
																		that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2.  Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.	
1413-0002	Individual	Beryl	Disney		Yes	Had 2	Not Stated	I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar	Not Stated		I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing	We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.	No				Support for policy HAD2 but concern that the plan for over 6000 homes puts this site at risk for speculative development	Support noted.  Should the plan be adopted this will safeguard from speculative development.	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt.			planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction.								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1414-0001	Individual	Alan	Disney		Yes	SP3	No	Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley. No credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site.	Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1 050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11 ,000.	No				No five year housing land supply North West Thundersley shgould have been included Approach to Green/Grey Belt	Five Year Housing Land Supply The Council is currently relying on the 1998 Adopted Local Plan which does not have up to date policies on housing supply, consequently, the five-year housing land supply position is calculated using the Government's Standard method. However, once a new plan is place, the housing target is set by that plan and not the Government's Standard method. The five-year housing land supply position is calculated from that target. It is therefore important that we continue to progress the Castle Point Plan. The Castle Point Plan will provide a rolling 5 year housing land supply. It	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
																		<p>should be noted that it is common for stepped increases in housing delivery to be set out and agreed in plans, as stepped changes respond to the capacity of the housing market to respond to and deliver against new housing targets. In the first ten years of the plan the Council's aim is to deliver 231 homes per year on average. It then expects to step up delivery again from year 11 onwards to 555 homes per year on average. It is these delivery rates that will be used to calculate the five-year housing land supply position once the Castle Point Plan is adopted, and from that point onwards. For further information please see</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>housing topic paper.</p> <p>North West Thundersley North West Thundersley is in the Green Belt. For those reasons set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper, it was not included within the plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is not considered that the site is deliverable for those reasons set out in the SOCG between CP and ECC and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.</p> <p>Green/Grey Belt The Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review in accordance with</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
																		the requirements of the Governments guidance. After a thorough review, backed up by strong evidence (as set out in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper), the Council has found several clear reasons, when considered together, to rule out Green Belt sites for development. These are not limited to; Evidence of the value of the natural environment in Castle Point, Evidence of the value of heritage assets in Castle Point, Evidence of the role of greenfield sites in providing flood mitigation, Evidence of the capacity of the highway network in and around Castle Point, Evidence of the impact of the Green Belt sites	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. 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
																		that were promoted to us would have on the landscape and on the number of additional cars that will enter the local highway network and Evidence that parts of our Green Belt fulfil a strong Green Belt purpose. Green Belt/Grey belt is addressed under policy GB2.  Where our Green Belt Review indicates that a site may potentially be Grey Belt, it does not automatically mean that it is an appropriate development site for those reasons set out above.	
1414-0002	Individual	Alan	Disney		Yes	Had 2	Not Stated	I do totally agree with Had2 Policy, for the Hadleigh Farm area, which states this site as environmental, recreational, nature recovery, biodiversity, agricultural, farming activities, nature conservation, SSSI, Ramsar	Not Stated		I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing	We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.	No				Support for policy HAD2 but concern that the plan for over 6000 homes puts this site at risk for speculative development	Support noted.  Should the plan be adopted this will safeguard from speculative development.	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								site, ecological restoration, habitat creation and connectivity, protection as an open space, promoting the heritage site, the Castle, and whatever is planned for this site in the future does not have a significant impact on the landscape or the Greenbelt.			planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army agree with this direction.								
1415-0001	Individual	Myra	Galley		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1416-0001	<b>ERROR</b>																		
1417-0001	Individual	Sue	Stevens		Not Stated	SP3	Not Stated	Planning for Glebelands I strongly disagree with these plans going ahead. As if there is not enough cars on the road from Sadlers to tarpots .. To take away more Green Belt Land. All the lorries etc needed to build .Lots of burst water pipes from Sadlers to Tarpots they are always digging up the road either side for one reason or another. the whole area From sadlers farm round to Rusbottom There are 3 schools in									Objections concerning Glebelands. Highways concerns and loss of Green Belt land.	The plan doesn't allocate any Green Belt land for development.	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
								rushbottom road . that is at a standstill when children are dropped off or picked up. They have coaches taking the children swimming etc. It is bedlam now. As for exit into Claire road> Are they going to knock properties down then as I cannot see how else anything could be attached to Clare Road. This has not been thought out properly at all. I live [Redacted Personal Information] even that is solid with cars although we all have a drive . Now days people average 4 cars per house. As the children can not afford to buy . lets say there are 2 cars per household that's 330. More cars . This just can not happen if there was an emergency we wouldn't be able to get on to the A13.											
1418-0001	Individual	Lorraine	Bird		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1419-0001	Individual	Julie	Anderson		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1420-0001	Individual	Janice	Wardle		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1027-0011	Agent	c/o agent	c/o agent	Taylor Wimpey	Yes	SD9	Yes		No	Effective	<p>Point 4 of Policy SD9 is not sound. It requires that ‘All new development should demonstrate that adequate foul water treatment and drainage already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. This must include confirmation that there is adequate quantitative and qualitative capacity at the Water Recycling Centre that will serve the development.’ However, Water Companies have an obligation under the Water Industry Act to connect to the public sewerage network, subsection (1) of Section 106 reads:  106 Right to communicate with public sewers  (1) Subject to the provisions of this section—  (a) the owner or occupier of any premises, or  (b) the owner of any private sewer which drains premises,  shall be entitled to have his drains or sewer communicate with the public sewer of any sewerage undertaker and thereby to discharge foul water and surface water from those premises or that private sewer.</p> <p>Therefore, Policy SD9 it is not sound - Part 4 is not</p>	Delete part 4.	No	Not Answered		A	Point 4 of Policy SD9 is not sound. It requires that ‘All new development should demonstrate that adequate foul water treatment and drainage already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. This must include confirmation that there is adequate quantitative and qualitative capacity at the Water Recycling Centre that will serve the development.’ Therefore, Policy SD9 it is not sound - Part 4 is not necessary or effective, and it should be deleted.	Noted	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
											necessary or effective, and it should be deleted.								
1422-0001	Individual	Carli	Bannan		Yes	SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with national policy	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to be unsound. It fails the tests of soundness for justified and consistent with national policy. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.					Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley No credible five-year housing land supply. It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a	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
																	<p>Thundersley site. Reduce the Urban Housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050, Hadleigh at 305. Total housing target of 11,000.</p> <p><u>Housing Supply – 5 Year Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p><u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4)</p>	<p>realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.</p>	

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
																		outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.  <u>Green Belt/Grey Belt</u> Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting Green Belt Assessments.	
1422-0002	Individual	Carli	Bannan		Yes	Had 2	Not Stated	I also agree the Had2 Policy is about protecting this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development, but this unsound plan for 6,200 homes, put's the Hadleigh farmland site at risk to speculative development, needing planning objections with respect to urban sprawl, it's a buffer zone, the effect on highways and traffic, lack of infrastructure, protecting our farmland and wildlife, out of character, open space, heritage, archaeology, promoting historic links, and use grey belt first. Any development on this site effects both Hadleigh and the neighbouring area of Leigh on Sea. I can fully support this Had2 Policy with no housing development ever on this farmland site, and I hope the Salvation Army	Not Stated			We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.					We need a C6 Policy for this farmland site, the South Hadleigh Green Lung, to protect and enhance a strategic green infrastructure asset between Hadleigh and Leigh on Sea.	The Had2 Policy protects this Greenbelt site as not suitable for development	N

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 und?	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
								agrees with this direction, as this would personally impact me, hugely decreasing the value and view of my home that backs on to this historic site that was purchased with the understanding the land was strictly used for agricultural training, with the castle itself becoming a monument and restrictions involve protecting the land as Green Belt and preventing housing developments (like those once proposed on Salvation Army land), preserving views, wildlife, and archaeological potential.											
1423-0001	Individual	Roger	Gibbs			Page 31, Section 7 - Place Based Approach. (Ref Thundersley)	Not Stated	First, my thanks to you all at the Planning Department on what appears a very well presented and thoughtful plan. Overall my only comment would be that we must try hard to keep down the number of new houses that must be squashed in. Our borough has a tiny area compromised by an excessively large proportion of historically designated green belt. I can see you equally recognise the problem. I will only focus my views on the Thundersley area [REDACTED Personal Information]	Not Stated		The diagram illustrates a problem where the area of Thundersley is “C” shaped. The wider Chase developments (and many new developments off Kiln Road etc) have no proper footpath connection to Thundersley village. The route along the un-made middle of The Chase is narrow, generally muddy, and made unsafe with frequent vehicles splashing past walkers. At night it is a no-go route. Please make it a priority to provide a well lit, hard path for pedestrians going from the eastern part of The Chase developments towards Thundersley village. It would probably make a good contribution to					Generally supportive of a very well presented and thoughtful plan.  The diagram illustrates a problem where the area of Thundersley is “C” shaped. The wider Chase developments (and many new developments off Kiln Road etc) have no proper footpath connection to Thundersley village. The route along the un-made middle of The Chase is narrow, generally muddy, and made unsafe with	Noted. Highways and Public Rights of Way are both County matters and managed by Essex County Council <a href="https://www.essexhighways.org/roads-and-pavements/public-right-of-way-maintain">https://www.essexhighways.org/roads-and-pavements/public-right-of-way-maintain</a>  The Plan has endeavoured to produce policies that protect and enhance the Borough's valued biodiversity and	N	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											<p>reducing short car usage between these points for children going to / from school, visits to doctors, chemist, etc. The point above also highlights the lack of any bus routes serving this area. Wensley Road is another muddy track making it unsuitable for easy walking to the Kiln Road bus routes. We had expected a footpath from The Swale into the recent Kiln Road housing. (Presumably the developers didn't want to lose a few feet of housing opportunity ?) No bus routes now serve Rayleigh Road. Delighted to see a commitment to preventing Coalescence between Thundersley / Benfleet / Hadleigh / Daws Heath. I hope this will be enshrined in true protection. There are still a few remaining areas of woodland and fields along The Chase, Wensley Road, Swale Road, Warren Chase, that have somehow survived the developers. Can we please get some firm legal protection on the these vital green plots. When we came to the area in [REDACTED Personal Information] it was common the see hundreds of varieties of birds, and animal species. Now is mostly seagulls, magpies, and rats. A lot more is still</p>						<p>frequent vehicles splashing past walkers. At night it is a no-go route. Please make it a priority to provide a well lit, hard path for pedestrians going from the eastern part of The Chase developments towards Thundersley village. It would probably make a good contribution to reducing short car usage between these points for children going to / from school, visits to doctors, chemist, etc. The point above also highlights the lack of any bus routes serving this area. Wensley Road is another muddy track making it unsuitable for easy walking to the Kiln Road bus routes. We had expected a footpath from The Swale into the recent Kiln Road housing. (Presumably the developers didn't want to lose a few feet of housing opportunity ?) No</p>	green infrastructure.	



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											about, although harder to find. They are just clinging to survival in a few areas. Please don't just leave your commitments to nature and wildlife corridors as empty words on paper.						bus routes now serve Rayleigh Road. Delighted to see a commitment to preventing Coalescence between Thundersley / Benfleet / Hadleigh / Daws Heath. I hope this will be enshrined in true protection. There are still a few remaining areas of woodland and fields along The Chase, Wensley Road, Swale Road, Warren Chase, that have somehow survived the developers. Can we please get some firm legal protection on the these vital green plots. When we came to the area in 1985 it was common the see hundreds of varieties of birds, and animal species. Now is mostly seagulls, magpies, and rats. A lot more is still about, although harder to find. They are just clinging to survival in a few areas. Please don't just leave your		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	commitments to nature and wildlife corridors as empty words on paper.		
1424-0001	Individual	Sheila	Clifford		Yes	SP3	No	I consider the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft to not be legally compliant, as it has failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply.	No	Justified, Consistent with National Policy	It is not consistent with national policy, it doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added, and the exclusion of the North West Thundersley site, the NPPF guidelines state development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led.	The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.					Failed to consider strategic alternatives like North West Thundersley and it has no credible five-year housing land supply. Doesn't meet the housing target for Castle Point, and site selection ignores Greenbelt / Grey Belt against new NPPF guidelines. It is not justified, the site selection strategy is biased and predetermined towards a "no Greenbelt build policy", it is solely based on the "over development of Brownfield sites", has not considered all sites, with no Greenbelt / Grey Belt sites added. The NPPF guidelines state development should be directed	<u>North-West Thundersley</u> Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. <u>Housing Supply</u> Housing Supply: See housing topic paper. Plan to provide for rolling 5 year housing land	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
																	<p>away from areas at highest risk of flooding, SUDS measures are not appropriate for Canvey Island's unique geography and drainage infrastructure, the proposed 3316 urban homes for Canvey is not resident led. The following modifications are necessary to make the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft legally compliant and sound. Add North West Thundersley site, 187 Ha, as a Greenbelt, Grey Belt, Brownfield site option for 7500 homes. Reduce the urban housing target to 3500 from 6200, with Canvey at 1050. Total housing target of 11,000.</p>	<p>supply. <u>Green Belt</u> The Green Belt Assessment July 2025 reviewed all potential sites within Castle Point's Green Belt, these sites were then considered against further criteria including: environmental and heritage designations, flood risk, highways issues which impact viability, sustainability as well as having regard for the Essex LNRS and strategic opportunity areas for biodiversity improvements. Any potential grey belt sites identified within the Green Belt Assessment July 2025, were reviewed. However, none were considered suitable for development as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic</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
																		Paper August 2025. <u>Flooding and infrastructure</u> covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey SuDS Policy SD3 covers SuDS and part 3 states they must reflect and respond to site circumstances and have regard to the ECC SuDS design Guide for Essex. Canvey SuDS options have been considered through the SFRA.	
1424-0002	Individual	Sheila	Clifford		Yes	C4					The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures						The number of Canvey West homes puts residents in the East at risk with emergency evacuation procedures	Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	N
1424-0003	Individual	Sheila	Clifford		Yes	Hou5					The Hou5 Policy states, new park homes will only be supported on existing Park Home sites. All our homes are robust, make provision for cold weather and risk						Policy HOU5 should make provision for improved site environment for the local residents	Comments noted. Policy HOU5 does not restrict improvement to	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
											from flooding, but the Hou5 policy should allow further development which improves the overall site environment for the local residents.							the sites environment	
1425-0001	Individual	Richard	Cox		Yes	Whole Plan	No	Not fit for purpose	No	Consistent with National Policy	Does not address national policy requirements.	Needs broader vision and consideration of other areas for development (e.g Thundersley). Current proposals allocation of ‘grey belt’ is misleading and I don’t feel it is accurate. I feel that the plan lacks any robust and meaningful attempt to address national policy, which puts green belt and treasured community spaces at risk of development - when other, more suitable areas have not been considered, or included in the proposal.					Does not address national policy requirements. Needs broader vision and consideration of other areas for development (e.g Thundersley). Current proposals allocation of ‘grey belt’ is misleading and I don’t feel it is accurate. I feel that the plan lacks any robust and meaningful attempt to address national policy, which puts green belt and treasured community spaces at risk of development - when other, more suitable areas have not been considered, or included in the proposal.	All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Northwest Thundersley was considered but not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred. Green Belt/Grey belt covered under policy GB2 and supporting	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 Com plia 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
																		Green Belt Assessments.	
1027-0001	Agent	c/o agent	c/o agent	Taylor Wimpey c/o Lichfields	Yes	SP1	Yes		No	Effective, Consistent with national policy	<p>Policy SP1 states that ‘the Council will protect and enhance the Borough’s green and blue infrastructure for the benefit of wildlife, biodiversity, landscape, amenity, climate resilience and to support the health, wellbeing and enjoyment of them by residents and visitors’. The supporting text in paragraph 6.5 refers to the high quality of the natural environment across the Borough and 6.7 refers to ‘this rich landscape tapestry is highly valued and should be protected, and where possible enhanced’.</p> <p>However, this general widespread approach goes beyond the NPPF which states in paragraph 187 that planning policies should ‘contribute to and enhance’ the natural and local environment and, more specifically, by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan).</p>	This ‘blanket’ policy is therefore not Sound, as it is not consistent with the Framework and would not be effective. The policy makes no reference to the hierarchy of nature conservation sites and no distinction as to what ‘green spaces’ require protection through the NPPF and other legislation and which do not. This should be added.	Yes	Not Answered	Not Answered	A	Considers that Policy SP1 is too general and does not distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites and which green sites require protection	Designated sites are already protected in national policies. SP1 should be read in conjunction with these policies. SP1 also refers to the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy which will guide which and how green spaces should be protected and enhanced	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											<p>Further, significantly, paragraph 188 of the Framework states that plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework.</p> <p>This ‘blanket’ policy is therefore not Sound, as it is not consistent with the Framework and would not be effective. The policy makes no reference to the hierarchy of nature conservation sites and no distinction as to what ‘green spaces’ require protection through the NPPF and other legislation and which do not.</p>									
1427-0001	Individual	Danny	Brady		Yes	T1	Not Stated	The road infrastructure cannot cope with the amount of traffic we already have even weekends traffic is known to be at a standstill	Not Stated								The road infrastructure cannot cope with the amount of traffic we already have even weekends traffic is known to be at a standstill	Highways Impacts: The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, assessing impacts and recommending interventions.	N	
1427-0002	Individual	Danny	Brady		Yes	Infra3	Not Stated	The GP practices are overloaded and getting appointments is a genuine struggle. Local hospitals are at breaking point.	Not Stated								The GP practices are overloaded and getting appointments is a genuine struggle.	Infrastructure matters, including health, are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the	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
																	Local hospitals are at breaking point.	supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	
1427-0003	Individual	Danny	Brady		Yes	SP3	Not Stated	I am totally against any building on green belt or redefined green to gray belt.	Not Stated								Against any building on green belt or redefined green to gray belt.	Noted	N
1428-0001	Individual	G	Reeves-Nurse			SP3	Not Stated	Future building on Canvey Island is dangerous, for the following reasons:- The Island flooded with loss of life and it is possible it could happen again. There is not adequate roads for hundreds more cars, it is currently bad anyhow, for access on and off the Island. There are not adequate schools, GPs, dentists, medical services, shops of all descriptions, no emergency hospital service, no police station and lack of policing. I hope this helps the council decide not to build more houses on Canvey Island.	Not Stated								Future building on Canvey Island is dangerous, for the following reasons:- The Island flooded with loss of life and it is possible it could happen again. There is not adequate roads for hundreds more cars, it is currently bad anyhow, for access on and off the Island. There are not adequate schools, GPs, dentists, medical services, shops of all descriptions, no emergency hospital service, no police station and lack of policing. I hope this helps the council decide not to build more houses on Canvey Island.	Flooding and infrastructure covered by policies and supporting evidence in the form of the SFRA and IDP, including in relation to Canvey. Canvey Access: The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, including Canvey, assessing impacts and recommending interventions. The Essex Transport Strategy 'A Better Connected Essex' has set out a range of initiatives to improve access links to Canvey. Scheme Details can be found in	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
																		Appendix A. South Essex Implementation Plan	
1429-0001	Individual	Mrs	Collins		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Considers the Draft Plan to be sound.	Support noted	N
1430-0001	Individual	Roger	Webber		Yes	SP3	Not Stated	I understand that the Castle Point Plan 2026 - 2043 has been proposed and I have seen the publication, I have a lot of concern and understanding. From what I have read, I am not sure why you need to supply a minimum number of homes of 3,143. The largest amount in Castle point. You have tried to say that the proposals will benefit of people who live on Canvey? 3.13 Castle Point is well connected within the wider Essex area and London by the strategic highway and railway network. The A13, A127 and A130 within Castle Point link the Borough with opportunities in South Essex, Mid-Essex, and London. However, congestion on the strategic road network is significant at peak times, and there is a lack of resilience on these routes in the event of an incident I moved to Canvey in 2012 and worked in Basildon, by the time I retired, it had been getting worse, I was very pleased not to have to travel to Basildon and back each	Not Stated		The infrastructure on Canvey cannot cope with the of Gridlocked Roads every day. Sewerage, Drainage cannot cope now! Evacuation of people of people on the Island to safely. Is there a plan? Easier access for all the Emergency services at any time of day to get to where they are needed urgently. Road maintenance will increase. We do not have enough Doctors, Dentist now, most of the surgeries are full. Schools, pre-schools I find it strange that you have that produce a 219-page plan. I would like to know how much the plan costs and how many people were needed. I know you are very busy with what you do but what affect did this work effect their work. Did you need to employ Consultants. I get the feeling that you have made your mind up and you are wasting money which could have been use for more sensible projects. Who paid for all the plans? Please can you please reply. If I don't get a reply, it shows me that	Would it be possible for a meeting with a few Kings Park Village residents.					Concerned about highways impacts, infrastructure, drainage, emergency access. Concerned about the cost of the Plan. Wants a meeting arranged with a few Kings Park Village residents.	Infrastructure: Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Flooding: Flood risk covered in policies SD1-3 and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). Needs of emergency services considered in the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, assessing impacts and recommending local interventions.	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								week. 8.1 Canvey Island is to the south of the Borough and is the largest town in Castle Point with around 40,000 residents. Surely before we can entertain the 3,143 homes, with appropriately 6,286 extra cars for the extra homes, we need to be sure that it is feasible to have so many vehicles added to what we have.			you're not bothered about the residents. There are so many issues, if I carried on, I also would have to too many issues, so I await to hear from you.							These are identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Alongside this, the Local Transport Authority, Essex County Council, have prepared the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex includes wider local improvements to transport networks in and around Castle Point, including improved linkages to other areas. Growth in Castle Point will facilitate the delivery of the proposals in the Local Transport Plan 4 The Plan went on consultatiin including public events attended by Council staff and planning officers, all residents were welcome to attend and discuss the Plan, or particular	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																		aspects of the Plan.	
1431-0001	Individual	Sharon	Oneill		Yes	SD1	No	When was the relevant flood study done this area is prone to flooding and 3000+ houses are to be built here	No	Consistent with National Policy		More studies to be done on infrastructure drains roads and flooding risks	No				More studies to be done on infrastructure drains roads and flooding risks	Infrastructure: Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Flooding: Flood risk covered in policies SD1-3 and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	N
1431-0002	Individual	Sharon	Oneill		Yes	C1	No		No	Effective			No				The Castle Point Plan in relation to policy C1 is not legally compliant	Comments noted.	N
1432-0001	Individual	Daniel	Adamson		Yes	Had 4	Yes		No	Effective	114 homes on the land off Scrub Lane is far too many and would lead to gridlock on Scrub Lane and neighbouring roads. 25 homes would be a more suitable number for this space	Reduce the number of houses to be built on this land to something like 25.	No				114 homes on the land off Scrub Lane is far too many and would lead to gridlock on Scrub Lane and neighbouring roads. 25 homes would be a more suitable number for this space	Noted	N
1433-	Individual	Margaret	Wigley		Yes	Whole	Yes		No	Consistent with	It is great that the people have been listened to and the green belt is being	Think that the Thundersley area that could house a whole village with its own	No				It is great that the people have been listened to and the	North West Thundersley was considered but	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0001						Plan				National Policy	preserved. However the government may very well insist that more greenbelt must be used	amentities may satisfy the government that enough housing options have been included					green belt is being preserved. Think that the Thundersley area that could house a whole village with its own amentities may satisfy the government that enough housing options have been included	not preferred. The SOCG between CP and ECC set out the reasons why the site is not a preferred alternative for allocation and also the August 2025 North West Thundersley transport evidence. In addition, Sustainability Appraisal (Policy SP3 option 4) outlines why North West Thundersley was not preferred.	
1434-0001	Individual	Carloline	Barker		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Supports the Castle Point Plan Draft and considers it to be legally compliant	Support noted	N
1435-0001	Individual	Denise	Foot		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	I support the Castle Point Plan Draft I consider the Draft Plan to be legally compliant	Yes		I consider the Draft Plan to be sound.						Supports the Castle Point Plan Draft and considers it to be legally compliant	Support noted	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
1436-0001	Individual	Ian	Bussey		Yes	SP3	Yes		No	Effective, Justified	I write to submit representations on the Draft Castle Point Plan (Regulation 19) in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and in respect of the four tests of soundness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) paragraph 35. I request that my comments be duly made part of the consultation record and forwarded to the Inspector appointed to examine the Plan. Representation in summary: I contend that the Plan fails to meet the “justified” and “effective” tests of soundness because the spatial strategy and evidence base do not adequately demonstrate that the selected strategy is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives, nor that the Plan is deliverable within the Plan period. In particular, I raise significant concerns in relation to the treatment of Green Belt release and strategic infrastructure capacity. In respect of the soundness tests: I do not believe the Plan is justified (i.e., that it is based on a robust and credible assessment of the reasonable alternatives) in	The Plan should include a clearer viability and phasing schedule for strategic infrastructure delivery. It should identify which infrastructure items are critical to the delivery of strategic allocations, set out funding sources, responsibilities, timescales and trigger points for delivery. The Plan should include a commitment to review early if delivery falls behind schedule, with clear wording that triggers a fallback strategy (for example, if strategic sites cannot be delivered then alternative sites will be allocated). The spatial strategy should provide a more robust assessment of reasonable alternatives, including scenarios with less reliance on Green Belt release and more focus on urban intensification or brownfield redevelopment, and demonstrate why the chosen approach is preferred. The Plan should strengthen the duty to cooperate evidence by including signed Statements of Common Ground (or equivalent binding arrangements) with neighbouring authorities and infrastructure providers to demonstrate cross-boundary	Yes	To discuss the points further at the hearing			The Plan fails to meet the “justified” and “effective” tests of soundness because the spatial strategy and evidence base do not adequately demonstrate that the selected strategy is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives, nor that the Plan is deliverable within the Plan period. In particular, I raise significant concerns in relation to the treatment of Green Belt release and strategic infrastructure capacity. In respect of the soundness tests: I do not believe the Plan is justified (i.e., that it is based on a robust and credible assessment of the reasonable alternatives) in that the supporting evidence does not adequately demonstrate that the release of Green Belt land, or other strategic allocations, represent the most	<u>Duty to Cooperate</u> is addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common Ground. <u>Infrastructure:</u> Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Flooding: Flood risk covered in policies SD1-3 and the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). <u>Reasonable Options</u> All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											that the supporting evidence does not adequately demonstrate that the release of Green Belt land, or other strategic allocations, represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. I also contend the Plan is not effective (i.e., it is not deliverable and cannot be implemented as intended) because the evidence indicates that strategic infrastructure constraints mean the spatial strategy cannot be delivered within the Plan period. Paragraph 32 of the NPPF requires that local plans should be prepared on the basis of proportionate evidence. I note that the Council acknowledges infrastructure constraints in relation to certain strategic sites and that these constraints have implications for deliverability. For example, the FAQs on the Council website state that with respect to north-west Thundersley the Council considers that “the strategic infrastructure works required ... cannot be undertaken during the time period of the Plan”. CastlePoint If parts of the spatial strategy rely on sites whose infrastructure cannot realistically be	infrastructure constraints are addressed.					appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. I also contend the Plan is not effective (i.e., it is not deliverable and cannot be implemented as intended) because the evidence indicates that strategic infrastructure constraints mean the spatial strategy cannot be delivered within the Plan period. The Plan should strengthen the duty to cooperate evidence by including signed Statements of Common Ground (or equivalent binding arrangements) with neighbouring authorities and infrastructure providers to demonstrate cross-boundary infrastructure constraints are addressed.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											delivered within the Plan period, this undermines the Plan’s effectiveness and casts doubt on the justification of the chosen strategy. I also understand that concerns have been raised about the Council’s duty to cooperate and cross-boundary infrastructure. A commentary on the plan notes: “the absence of clear and binding agreements on cross-boundary infrastructure and housing distribution is a serious concern”. Canvey Green Belt Campaign The NPPF paragraph 35 states that a plan is sound if it is “positively prepared”, “justified”, “effective” and “consistent with national policy”. Where a plan does not properly evaluate reasonable alternatives or cannot show how it will be delivered, it fails the ‘justified’ and ‘effective’ limbs. Although the Council has published an evidence base, the mere existence of evidence is insufficient; the evidence must demonstrate that the selected strategy is the most appropriate, and that the Plan is realistic and deliverable. I consider the evidence insofar as it relates to strategic infrastructure and release of Green Belt land to fall								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											short of this requirement. Conclusion I respectfully ask the Council to treat this representation as a formal objection under Regulation 19, and to ensure that the Inspector is provided with a copy. The issues raised go to the heart of whether the Plan is justified and effective. Unless addressed, I consider the Plan fails the soundness tests and risks being found unsound at examination.								
1437-0001	Individual	Linda	Prigmore		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes		Yes								Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1438-0001	Individual	Mr	Roberts		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes		No	Justified	Don't need any more houses. It will cause more congestion and pollution	None. Leave the green belt alone due to the wildlife	No				Don't need any more houses. It will cause more congestion and pollution. None. Leave the green belt alone due to the wildlife	Noted	N
1439-0001	Individual	Rachael	John		Yes	Whole Plan	Yes		Yes				No				Castle Point Plan is sound and legally compliant,	Support Noted	N
1441-0001	Agent	Rupert	Wood	Thames Enterprise Park Ltd	Yes	For word	Yes		No	Consistent with National Policy	The Vision should be amended to ensure consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly its emphasis on effective cooperation between local authorities.	As set out previously in our response to the Issues & Options Regulation 18 Consultation, we welcome the emphasis on creating a well balanced community, combining housing, improved transport network and employment opportunities. However, the	No				As set out previously in our response to the Issues & Options Regulation 18 Consultation, we welcome the emphasis on creating a well balanced	Cooperation with neighbouring authorities is addressed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement and supporting Statements of Common	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												vision should be amended to ensure consistency with the NPPF, particularly its emphasis on effective cooperation between local authorities. This can be achieved by incorporating a clear commitment to improving connectivity with employment sites across the wider regional economic area, including Thurrock. Strengthening transport links between Castle Point and nearby employment centres will make it easier for residents to access jobs locally. Addressing these strategic cross-boundary issues is essential to meet NPPF requirements for sustainable development. The Vision should highlight the importance of building strong partnerships with neighbouring authorities, such as Thurrock, to tackle shared challenges around transport, housing, and infrastructure. In addition, Castle Point should seek to maximise opportunities relating to the estuary as an economic growth opportunity, recognising its potential for trade and associated employment benefits.					community, combining housing, improved transport network and employment opportunities. The Vision should be amended to ensure consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly its emphasis on effective cooperation between local authorities. This can be achieved by incorporating a clear commitment to improving connectivity with employment sites across the wider regional economic area, including Thurrock. Strengthening transport links between Castle Point and nearby employment centres will make it easier for residents to access jobs locally. Addressing these strategic cross-boundary issues is essential to meet NPPF requirements for sustainable development. The	Ground. Castle Point's wider economic context is addressed in Ch 14.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	Vision should highlight the importance of building strong partnerships with neighbouring authorities, such as Thurrock, to tackle shared challenges around transport, housing, and infrastructure. In addition, Castle Point should seek to maximise opportunities relating to the estuary as an economic growth opportunity, recognising its potential for trade and associated employment benefits.		
1441-0002	Agent	Rupert	Wood	Thames Enterprise Park Ltd	Yes	C5	Yes		No	Consistent with National Policy	Policy C5 identifies the need to improve access to and around Canvey Island, but it should be strengthened to ensure the Local Plan delivers sustainable and strategic connectivity in line with the NPPF.	Improving access to and through the wider South Essex region is critical for long-term economic vitality and quality of life. Current transport links are inadequate, contributing to congestion and limiting Canvey Island's potential for growth. To address this, the policy should include a clear commitment to upgrading the strategic road network, particularly the A130, which provides a key link between Canvey Island and surrounding areas. Enhancing this route will help alleviate congestion	No				Policy C5 identifies the need to improve access to and around Canvey Island, but it should be strengthened to ensure the Local Plan delivers sustainable and strategic connectivity in line with the NPPF. Improving access to and through the wider South Essex region is critical for long-term economic vitality and quality of life.	Access options to Canvey with be investigated in more detail in the forthcoming feasibility study.	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												and improve access to employment opportunities in Thurrock and beyond. In addition to road improvements, expanding public transport services is essential. More frequent and reliable bus connections between Canvey Island, Basildon, and Thurrock would reduce car dependency and promote sustainable travel. Similarly, integrating cycling infrastructure would provide residents with viable alternatives, supporting carbon reduction and healthier lifestyles. Rail Freight should also be highlighted as a key component to improve the movement of goods into and out of the region. This is essential for supporting sustainable logistics and reducing reliance on road transport. Investing in multimodal transport solutions will ensure Canvey Island remains well-connected and resilient to future growth pressures. This approach will support economic development, environmental sustainability and social inclusion, aligning Policy C5 with NPPF requirements for sustainable and coordinated development. In addition, Castle Point should seek to maximise opportunities relating to the estuary as an					Current transport links are inadequate, contributing to congestion and limiting Canvey Island's potential for growth. To address this, the policy should include a clear commitment to upgrading the strategic road network, particularly the A130, which provides a key link between Canvey Island and surrounding areas. Enhancing this route will help alleviate congestion and improve access to employment opportunities in Thurrock and beyond. In addition to road improvements, expanding public transport services is essential. More frequent and reliable bus connections between Canvey Island, Basildon, and Thurrock would reduce car dependency and promote		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												economic growth opportunity, recognising its potential for trade, tourism and associated employment benefits.					sustainable travel. Similarly, integrating cycling infrastructure would provide residents with viable alternatives, supporting carbon reduction and healthier lifestyles. Rail Freight should also be highlighted as a key component to improve the movement of goods into and out of the region. This is essential for supporting sustainable logistics and reducing reliance on road transport. Investing in multimodal transport solutions will ensure Canvey Island remains well-connected and resilient to future growth pressures. This approach will support economic development, environmental sustainability and social inclusion, aligning Policy C5 with NPPF requirements for sustainable and coordinated		

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
																	development. In addition, Castle Point should seek to maximise opportunities relating to the estuary as an economic growth opportunity, recognising its potential for trade, tourism and associated employment benefits.		
1441-0003	Agent	Rupert	Wood	Thames Enterprise Park Ltd	Yes	C3	Yes		No	Not Stated			No				Policy C3 is legally compliant but not sound	Comment noted.	N
0078-0001	Organisation	Geoff	Blackledge	The Castle Point Wildlife Group	Yes	Whole Plan	Yes	The Castle Point Wildlife Group Registered Charity Number 1139395 support the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft Consultation. The Group works to protect and increase the biodiversity in the remaining green spaces in Castle Point for the benefit of wildlife. This in turn provides clean air and safe, open spaces for the benefit of residents health and recreation.	Yes		It seems to the Group that the Draft Plan allows a balanced growth for jobs, housing, infrastructure etc while retaining important green spaces. The Group considers the draft plan to be legally compliant and the Group considers the draft plan to be sound.		Not Stated		No	A	The Castle Point Wildlife Group Registered Charity Number 1139395 support the Castle Point Plan Regulation 19 Draft Consultation. The Group works to protect and increase the biodiversity in the remaining green spaces in Castle Point for the benefit of wildlife. This in turn provides clean air and safe, open spaces for the benefit of residents health and	Support noted.	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
																	recreation. It seems to the Group that the Draft Plan allows a balanced growth for jobs, housing, infrastructure etc while retaining important green spaces. The Group considers the draft plan to be legally compliant and the Group considers the draft plan to be sound.		
0958-0001	Individual	Philip	Howe	The People's Independent Party	Yes	SP3	Yes		Yes		I strongly support the Plan's strategy to meet housing needs primarily through brownfield regeneration and urban capacity optimisation, thereby upholding the strong community commitment to protecting the Green Belt. This demonstrates the Council has been positively prepared and has appropriately responded to the strong direction in the revised NPPF to be ambitious with brownfield land and avoid Green Belt release where possible.		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		I strongly support the Plan's strategy to meet housing needs primarily through brownfield regeneration and urban capacity optimisation, thereby upholding the strong community commitment to protecting the Green Belt. This demonstrates the Council has been positively prepared and has appropriately responded to the strong direction in the revised NPPF to be ambitious with brownfield land and avoid	Support noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	Green Belt release where possible.		
0958-0002	Individual	Philip	Howe	The People's Independent Party	Yes	C1	Yes		Yes		The Plan is effective because Policy C1 (Canvey Town Centre Master Plan) provides a comprehensive, phased strategy for regeneration. This master-planning approach, which includes a clear 'Investment Proposition' and 'Delivery Plan,' demonstrates a proactive, market-facing approach that is already proving successful by attracting the £20 million Long-Term Plan for Towns funding. This makes the Plan highly deliverable.		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		Supports the Castle Point Plan and Policy C1	Support noted.	N
0958-0003	Individual	Philip	Howe	The People's Independent Party	Yes	SP4	Yes		Yes		I support Policy SP4 (Development Contributions), which provides the necessary framework to secure financial and physical contributions from developers. This policy ensures that new growth will pay for the essential supporting infrastructure (e.g., roads, education, healthcare) and is a robust mechanism to ensure the Plan is effective and does not place an unfair burden on existing residents.		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		I support Policy SP4 (Development Contributions), which provides the necessary framework to secure financial and physical contributions from developers. This policy ensures that new growth will pay for the essential supporting infrastructure (e.g., roads, education, healthcare) and is a robust mechanism to ensure the Plan is effective and does	Support noted.	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	not place an unfair burden on existing residents.		
0958-0004	Individual	Philip	Howe	The People's Independent Party	Yes	T1	Yes		Yes		The Transport Strategy (Policy T1) is consistent with National Policy by prioritising walking, cycling, and public transport through the creation of Mobility Hubs and requiring contributions to alleviate congestion. This integrated approach is essential to achieving net-zero ambitions and mitigating the impacts of growth on the Borough's highly constrained road network.		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		The Transport Strategy (Policy T1) is consistent with National Policy by prioritising walking, cycling, and public transport through the creation of Mobility Hubs and requiring contributions to alleviate congestion. This integrated approach is essential to achieving net-zero ambitions and mitigating the impacts of growth on the Borough's highly constrained road network.	Support noted.	N
0958-0005	Individual	Philip	Howe	The People's Independent Party	Yes	Forword	Yes		Yes		I believe the Council has been positively prepared due to the high level of community engagement throughout the plan's preparation. The final draft clearly reflects the overwhelming community preference for a brownfield-first strategy and targeted investment in town centres, which validates the Council's approach.		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		Support for the plan and that it represents the outcomes of the consultations and reflects what the local community has asked for.	Support noted.	N
0958-	Individual	Philip	Howe	The People's	Yes	SP3	Yes		Yes		I support the Council's approach to determining the housing requirement.		Not An	Not Ans	Yes		I support the Council's approach to determining the	Support noted.	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0006				Independent Party							The strategy to focus delivery within the existing urban footprint, rather than relying on unsustainable Green Belt sites, is the most appropriate and Justified response given the severe physical and environmental constraints of the Borough, including high flood risk and limited highway capacity.		swere d	wer ed			housing requirement. The strategy to focus delivery within the existing urban footprint, rather than relying on unsustainable Green Belt sites, is the most appropriate and Justified response given the severe physical and environmental constraints of the Borough, including high flood risk and limited highway capacity.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1002-0001	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	Forward	No	The Regulation 19 consultation has not been undertaken properly, with two materially different versions of the Local Plan on the Council's website, and important documents added to the document library midway through the consultation period.	No	Positively prepared	<p>Please refer to Appendix A for full details.</p> <p>Castle Point is not entitled to have taken the strategic approach that it has to the delivery of homes. The result is a Plan that advocates the delivery of around half of the homes that are actually needed (with reference to the Standard Method). The Council's justification for having taken this approach is not convincing and does not withstand scrutiny (for example, the suggestion that all Green Belt sites are unsustainable, when the Council's evidence base shows that GB8 is sustainably located). The Council will need to release Green Belt land for development to provide enough homes. The starting point in that process should be to release land that qualifies as 'Grey belt'. South of Hadleigh (GB8) is Grey Belt for the reasons described in these representations. The Council's Sustainability Appraisal Annexes (July 2025) confirms that the site has good public transport links and accessibility (pg. 579), has good access to local services (pg. 630 and is well served by health services (pg. 745).</p>	<p>Please refer to Appendix A for full details.</p> <p>Consult on all documents, and one version of draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Include allocations (including GB) to meet Standard Method Need.</p>	Yes	Not Answered	Yes	B - updated attachments	<p>The Regulation 19 Plan is not sound. Its approach to the delivery of homes falls significantly short of the Framework's requirements and the strategic approach to the allocation of land towards meeting needs is not appropriate. The Castle Point Plan needs to release Green Belt land to help it meet identified housing need and the Plan has not been positively prepared. Promotes the Hadleigh Estate (site reference GB8) as available, suitable and achievable for development of a mix of uses, including approximately 900 new homes. The Council's assessment of this site is flawed and inaccurate and on proper analysis, the Plan's policies should allocate this site for a mix of uses, including residential. This would assist the</p>	<p>Consideration of All Sites</p> <p>All reasonable option sites were considered in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>Procedural concern to be investigated.</p>	<p>Y - Policy Had2 – Hadleigh Country Park, Hadleigh Farm and Benfleet and Southend Marshes</p> <p>Minor modification (typographic error)</p> <p>2. Proposals related to the development and/or use of the farm for agricultural and/or training purposes in line with the charitable mission of the landowner,</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
											Contrary to the evidence presented by the Council, there would be no heritage or landscape harms arising from the allocation of the site for development that could not be mitigated through detailed design. This mitigation is reflected in the Masterplan for the site, which shows how around 900 homes could come forward, alongside a new Employment Training Centre and Rare Breeds Farm. These proposals would help to deliver the Mission of the Salvation Army, through the delivery of high-quality new extension to Hadleigh that is respectful of its neighbours and contributes towards the local community. As currently prepared, the Castle Point Plan is not sound and it should be revisited, so as to include the allocation of land at Hadleigh.						Council in delivering a Plan that better reflects its need.  Policy SP3 (Meeting Development Need). – Does not meet the standard method figure The release of this land GB8 for development would clearly represent a significant opportunity to further the work of the church and charity in these important areas in Castle Point, and beyond, through providing enhanced community facilities as part of the masterplan, and through the generation of capital receipts. Further benefits would include substantial new and high-quality open space to be enjoyed by the existing communities around Hadleigh Farm and beyond, and substantial land made available to provide biodiversity net-		where they do not have a significant impact on the landscape <b>or</b> the Green Belt, and comply with the requirements of policy ENV4 and other relevant policies of this Plan; or  <u>Paragraph 10.20</u> Also paragraph 10.20 of the supporting text says that ‘it is therefore critical that any development allowed does not

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>gains on a significant scale. A Vision Document and illustrative masterplan provided. the Council cannot currently demonstrate a Five Year Housing Land Supply. Questions evidence – Housing Topic Paper, SLAA and Heritage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>5. Policy Had2 (Hadleigh Country Park, Hadleigh Farm and Benfleet &amp; Southend Marshes.</p> <p>5.1 For the reasons described, we do not consider the draft Plan sound and do not support Policy Had2. We recognise that it broadly supports the provision of recreational, agricultural and training uses but it does not provide for much needed new homes at the site.</p> <p>5.2 In addition, there is a typographic error or Part 2 of the Policy ('where they do not</p>		<p>have an impact on the landscape'. Any scheme will have some level of impact on any landscape. This drafting should be revised to read 'any development allowed should not have a significant impact on the landscape'. That would reflect the language used in the main body of the Policy.</p> <p>Policies</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>have a significant impact on the landscape [or] the Green belt], which we request is corrected.</p> <p>5.3 Further, paragraph 10.20 of the supporting text says that ‘it is therefore critical that any development allowed does not have an impact on the landscape’. Any scheme will have some level of impact on any landscape. This drafting should be revised to read ‘any development allowed should not have a significant impact on the landscape’. That would reflect the language used in the main body of the Policy.</p> <p>5.4 With regard the Draft Policies Map, we have the following additional observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of the listed, and locally listed buildings are not accurate.</li> <li>• The key is not accurate for the Hadleigh Country</li> </ul>		<p><u>Map errors</u></p> <p>Hadleigh Estate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of the listed, and locally listed buildings are not accurate.</li> <li>• The key is not accurate for the Hadleigh Country Park, Hadleigh Farm, and Benfleet Southend Marches .</li> <li>• Diagonal on the key but hatched on the plan.</li> <li>• Schedul</li> </ul>

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>Park, Hadleigh Farm, and Benfleet Southend Marches. Diagonal on the key but hatched on the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheduled ancient monument key does not match the colour on the plan. Beige on key, and red on plan.</li> </ul> <p>Procedural concerns due to two versions of the draft plan being available on the website. Document entitled Regulation 19 Draft includes at Policy SP3 the plan will deliver 6,196 new homes over 17 years. The consultation response portal entitled 'Issues &amp; Options Consultation Document – July-September 2024 states that 5,100 new homes will be delivered over 20 years with a total of 3,595 homes within existing urban areas. This plan also says that grey belt sites in Canvey, Benfleet and Thundersley will be allocated for</p>		ed ancient monument key does not match the colour on the plan. Beige on key, and red on plan.

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	housing, although the capacity of those sites is left blank. Concerned that this will confuse respondents to the consultation especially in relation to the quantum of developed and whether green/grey belt sites are proposed to be released. The Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025) was introduced on the 15th August and noone was made aware of this addition despite it containing very pertinent information and concerned that not everyone is aware of it.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1002-0002	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	SP3	No	The Regulation 19 consultation has not been undertaken properly, with two materially different versions of the Local Plan on the Council's website, and important documents added to the document library midway through the consultation period.	No	Positively prepared	The requirements of the Framework with regard Plan making. 1.1 Paragraph 36 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that ‘plans are sound if they are...positively prepared, and provide a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs’. 1.2 Paragraph 62 states that ‘to determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the Standard Method in national planning practice guidance’. 1.3 The Council’s Housing Capacity Topic Paper (2025) recognises (at paragraph 3.5) that when applying the Standard Method as required by the Framework in arriving at an overall minimum housing need figure, the Castle Point Plan should seek to deliver 11,662 new homes over the Plan period (686 per annum x 17 years). The approach taken by the draft Plan. 1.4 The draft Castle Point Plan does not seek to deliver at least the minimum number of homes required, when utilising the Standard Method. Instead,		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		Perceived under-delivery of housing.	<u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period. CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery Castle Point’s approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											<p>it seeks to deliver 6,196 homes, entirely in existing ‘urban areas’ (i.e. on previously developed land). To achieve this figure, the Plan relies on a series of proposed allocations, existing commitments and windfall over the Plan period.</p> <p>1.5 The Plan seeks to deliver just over half of Castle Point’s objectively assessed need, with a shortfall of 5,466 homes over the plan period, or 321 per annum in each of the 17 years of the Plan. Such an approach does not meet the requirement to ‘positively prepare’ a Plan, and the draft Castle Point Plan is therefore unsound.</p> <p>1.6 Given that the shortfall against objectively assessed need is so great, we have not forensically explored the availability, suitability or deliverability of the sites that the Plan does propose to allocate. Although, taking the example of the proposed Hadleigh Town Centre Broad Area (Had1), we have seen nothing in the Council’s Evidence Base to indicate there is sufficient available land within the town centre to deliver a minimum of 388 new homes, that a scheme can be brought forward of a suitable design in Hadleigh</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
											at the proposed 125dph, or that there is any capacity to lose existing town centre car parks. It seems likely that the total number of homes proposed by the draft Plan is likely to be found unrealistic under scrutiny. 1.7 The Housing Capacity Topic Paper identifies at paragraph 4.18 that the borough’s existing settlements cannot sustainably absorb 686 homes per annum (the need calculated with reference to the Standard Method) within urban areas. That being the case, the correct approach is to turn to land outside of the existing urban areas in Castle Point to ‘make up’ the substantial shortfall in supply against need. All land outside of existing boundaries of urban areas in Castle Point is designated as Green Belt. Consequentially, the Council will need to turn to releasing Green Belt land for new homes to meet the needs of its communities. 1.8 The Hadleigh Farm Estate (site reference GB8) has been mis-assessed in the Council’s evidence base documents to the Plan and on proper analysis, and when seeking to meet the actual need for homes in Castle Point, should be								

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

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1002-0003	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	SP3	No	The Regulation 19 consultation has not been undertaken properly, with two materially different versions of the Local Plan on the Council's website, and important documents added to the document library midway through the consultation period.	No	Positively prepared	SEE ATTACHMENT FOR TABLES AND FIGURES Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025). 3.1 The Council's Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025) 'sifts' Green Belt land within the Borough, first with reference to what it calls 'critical or strong constraints'. The land promoted for development at the Hadleigh Estate is not constrained by any of the factors considered in this assessment as is shown in the extract below. 3.2 As such, the site is identified by the Housing Capacity Topic Paper as being 'potentially unconstrained Green Belt', as reflected in the extract below (taken from pg. 33 of the document). 3.3 Paragraph 12.4 of the Housing Capacity Topic Paper confirms that transport analysis of the Green Belt sites promoted for allocation in the Plan (including this site, 'GB8'), as set presented at Regulation 18 stage did not identify problems with the transport network in accommodating these sites, other than in the case of northwest of Thundersley. This demonstrates that the development of 'GB8' can be accommodated within		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		Promoites site GB8	Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											<p>the highways network, subject to mitigation.</p> <p>3.4 Whilst paragraph 12.12 of the Housing Capacity Topic Paper (August 2025) concludes that ‘it is appropriate and in accordance with the NPPF to avoid development in the Green Belt [generally] as it would not be sustainably located and would impact on traffic capacity on the local highway network’ that conclusion does not hold true in the case of the Hadleigh Estate, where elsewhere in the Council’s evidence base the site is shown to be sustainably located and compatible with the capacity of the highways network, with ‘high connectivity’ (see Figure 1.1.4 above). We have explained the access strategy for the site in further detail below.</p> <p>The site Access Strategy. Walking and Cycling.</p> <p>3.5 The site masterplan is being developed to ensure excellent pedestrian and cyclist connectivity to the local area, and to provide attractive walking and cycling routes through the development. To the north of the site there is footway provision on Chapel Lane and Castle Lane and both streets are residential in character, with street lighting and 30mph speed</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
											limits. These roads are also relatively lightly trafficked. Pedestrian and cycle access can be provided along these routes which provide convenient walking and cycling routes towards the local services and facilities within Hadleigh. 3.6 Connections for pedestrians and cyclists can also be provided onto the A13 (both via the site frontage and via Park Chase) and to the east of the site linking to Leigh-on-Sea as part of the proposed development. These accesses, in combination with new strategic walking and cycling routes across the site, will improve pedestrian and cycle access for both new and existing residents between Hadleigh and Leigh-on-Sea. 3.7 The existing Public Rights of Way (PROW) through the site can be retained and enhanced. Vehicular Access 3.8 Vehicular access can be achieved to the site from two new accesses onto the A13. The primary vehicle access into the site would be a three-arm roundabout located broadly in the centre of the site. To achieve this, the A13 would be realigned into the site immediately either side of the new roundabout and a service road would be								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											provided to retain access to existing properties to the north. This has the benefit of minimising the impact of the access on the existing trees along the southern side of the A13 and the existing properties on the northern side of the road. 3.9 A secondary, smaller vehicle access would be provided at the eastern end of the site in the form of a ghost island priority junction (allowing vehicles to turn into the site from both directions, but only allowing vehicles to turn left out of the site). Fewer vehicles would use this access, and it would be intended to serve a small number of homes at the eastern end of the site. 3.10 It is proposed that these two new accesses with the A13 would be the primary vehicular accesses to the site, designed to serve the majority of the development. Two small parcels of new homes are then proposed to be accessed via Castle Lane and Chapel Lane. 3.11 Only pedestrians and cyclists would be able to route between the proposed A13 accesses and Castle Lane. This would ensure that a limited number of new houses would be accessed from Chapel Lane and Castle								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											Lane so that these routes are retained as attractive walking and cycling routes. Promoting sustainable transport. 3.12 The UK Government has set out the impact of transport on carbon emissions and within the document ‘Decarbonising Transport: A Greener, Better Britain’ there are numerous commitments to encouraging modal shift to active travel modes to reduce carbon emissions. The land being promoted for development is ideally located to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport as opposed to the private car, to assist with reducing carbon emissions associated with transport. Local Services and Facilities. 3.13 Hadleigh High Street is within a 12-minute walk and a 4-minute cycle of the development and has a number of everyday services and facilities including supermarkets, shops, cafes, restaurants, takeaways, pubs, a pharmacy and hairdressers. Hadleigh Infant and Junior School is also within a 15-20-minute walk and a 6-7-minute cycle. The site is therefore ideally located to encourage travel by active modes, and there is good								



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											<p>provision for pedestrians and cyclists which can be improved between the site and these destinations to encourage trips on foot and by bike.</p> <p>Public Transport.</p> <p>3.14 The A13 is a key public transport corridor in the area and the bus stops along the A13 (which the site fronts) are served by very frequent services (every 5 minutes in both directions) providing links to key employment, shopping, education and leisure destinations. There is an opportunity to provide a mobility hub near the access and existing bus services on the A13 to facilitate the interchange between walking, cycling and public transport. The site therefore benefits from excellent access to bus services to encourage the use of public transport as opposed to the car.</p> <p>3.15 Leigh-on-Sea Railway Station is located to the east of the site and provides connections to Southend-on-Sea to the east and Basildon and Tilbury to the west. The services to the west also provide access into London. New strategic walking and cycling routes across the site can provide access to Leigh-on-Sea Railway Station for new residents and also assist</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
											with improving access for existing residents in Hadleigh. 3.16 The site is therefore ideally located to encourage a shift to active travel modes and the use of public transport to reduce the reliance on the private car. Transport impact. 3.17 Any planning application for the site would be accompanied by a vision-led transport assessment that outlined and assessed the proposals in detail. This would include up-to-date background traffic survey data, details of all access proposals, forecasts for the walking, cycling, public transport and vehicle trips that the development could generate and a detailed assessment of the likely impacts on the A13 and other roads in the vicinity of the site. A sustainable travel plan would also be produced to identify a package of transport measures to encourage walking, cycling and public transport to and from the site. This will allow the local planning and highway authorities to assess the likely impact of the development on the local transport network. The Plan's approach to Green Belt sites.								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											3.18 The Hadleigh Estate (or ‘South of Hadleigh / GB8) is noted at para. 13.10 of the Housing Capacity Statement as one of the 34 Green Belt sites ‘identified for further consideration’ for appraisal through the SLAA (discussed in detail below). Of these, the Topic Paper describes that 17 sites (part of 5 sites, and 12 ‘whole’ sites) should ‘continue to be considered further’. 3.19 The status in the context of Plan making of being ‘considered further’ is not clear. These 17 sites are not proposed allocations in the Regulation 19 Plan. It may be that the Council is anticipating scrutiny as to its proposed housing delivery at Examination stage and is holding these sites ‘in reserve’ in case they need to be relied upon. 3.20 In any event, South of Hadleigh’ (GB8) is not one of these 17 sites. The document indicates that this is because of conclusions reached in the Council’s Green Belt Assessment (2025), Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Outline Landscape Appraisal – Part 2 (2024) and a bespoke Heritage Impact Assessment relating to GB8. 3.21 The findings of these								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											documents in so far as they relate to South of Hadleigh are inaccurate for the reasons described in detail below. It is important that at para. 14.3 of the Topic Paper, the Council identifies that if the 17 sites that should ‘continue to be considered further’ were allocated for development, the Plan’s shortfall against the Standard method housing supply figure would be 1,664. The Masterplan scheme for this site shows around 900 new homes being delivered, which would clearly make a very important contribution towards Castle Point’s ability to meet its need, resulting in a shortfall of only around 700. 3.22 Whilst we cannot comment in detail of the suitability of these 17 sites that it appears may be brought into the Plan, we can comment on the appropriateness of bringing in this site and it is clear having reviewed the Council’s evidence base, and the expert advice of consultants supporting the promotion of this land, that this should happen. Green Belt Assessment (July 2025). 3.23 Firstly, GB8 should be regarded as Grey Belt in the terms of the NPPF. 3.24 The Glossary to the								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											Framework defines Grey belt as: ‘Land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. ‘Grey belt’ excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development’. 3.25 In order therefore to constitute ‘Grey belt’ the land at South of Hadleigh must not ‘strongly contribute’ towards the following Green Belt purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 3.26 The Council’s Green Belt Assessment cross refers to the Castle Point Borough Green Belt Review part 1 (2018). That document has also been submitted as evidence in support of the Regulation 19 Plan. 3.27 The 2025 Assessment								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											describes that the 2018 review ‘did not evaluate purpose d) (preserving historic settings) as it was not deemed applicable to the specific context of Castle Point’ (para.2.7.5). That remains the case, and so purpose d) of Para.143 of the Framework is not applicable to an assessment of whether South of Hadleigh should be regarded as Grey Belt. 3.28 The 2018 Review did however assess each [Green Belt] parcel [within Castle Point] individually ‘to determine its contribution’ to purpose a) and purpose b) (the remaining purposes relevant to an assessment of ‘Grey belt’). Paragraph 2.7.7 of the 2025 Assessment describes that the 2018 Review then ‘mapped out the cumulative contributions of each parcel...highlighting parcels with the highest overall significance to the Green Belt’ (noting that the only remaining purposes being considered are a), b) and c). 3.29 The result of this exercise was the preparation of a Plan to show ‘Locally Important Strategic Green Belt Areas’ (below). 3.30 It should be noted that the site at South of Hadleigh (Parcel 15) is not								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											identified as one of these areas, indicating that it is not considered to ‘strongly contribute’ to either purpose a) or purpose b). 3.31 The 2025 Green Belt Assessment then goes on to ‘reassess’ land within the 2018 parcels against the relevant paragraph 143 purposes, with the parcel boundaries redefined so that they align with the site boundaries of Green Belt sites that have been promoted for including in the Plan and called ‘subareas’. The South of Hadleigh ‘subarea’ has the reference GB8 and its boundary is closely aligned with that of Parcel 15 of the 2018 Review. 3.32 The 2025 Assessment identifies that GB8 performs ‘moderately’ against purpose a) (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas). Whilst we do not agree with that assessment because we think that is an overstatement of the value of the land against that purpose, it is immaterial because if the subarea performs moderately as the Council says, it is not ‘strongly contributing’, which is the paragraph 143 Grey belt test. 3.33 That then only leaves purpose b). When considering purpose b)								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											(preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another), the 2025 Assessment considers that GB8 performs strongly. That is in itself surprising, because the 2018 Review evidently dis not reach the same conclusion (because the parcel was not a ‘Locally Important Green Belt Area’) and it is not clear what might have changed between then and now. 3.34 Explanation for this finding is provided at page 65 of the Appendices to the 2025 Assessment, where it is stated that: ‘Development of the sub-area would lead to the coalescence between Hadleigh and Leigh-On-Sea in this location. Although it is accepted that these built-up areas already merge directly to the north of the sub-area and the A13, the sub-area forms a substantial part of the remaining gap between Hadleigh and Leigh-On-Sea, the development of which would result in the loss of visual separation between towns’. 3.35 The Council has, respectfully, misdirected itself with its analysis of ‘the remaining gap’ and visual separation between towns’. Purpose b) is simply ‘to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another’.								



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required						
											<p>3.36 Hadleigh and Leigh and Sea are neighbouring towns that have long since merged into one another and so subarea GB8 makes no contribution to that purpose. The settlements have either merged or they have not merged – they cannot have ‘partially’ merged as the Council’s analysis seems to indicate. In this case. The experience for anybody travelling along the A13 is that they pass between two towns through continuous urban development because the towns are merged together – there is no ‘gap’ between them. Even if that Council’s approach to this assessment was correct, it cannot reasonably be the case that the site ‘strongly contributes’ to this purpose in these circumstances.</p> <p>3.37 South of Hadleigh therefore does not contribute strongly to Paragraph 143 purposes a), b) or d), and it should be regarded as Grey Belt land. The Council should be treating this site like the 17 other sites that the Council refers in its Housing Capacity Study as for ‘further consideration’. That is particularly the case given that even if those 17 sites were allocated (and those sites in the current version of the Plan were</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>robust in their ability to deliver the homes set out in the Plan period), there remains a large shortfall that the allocated of GB8 would significantly assist in addressing.</p> <p>Hadleigh Heritage Impact Assessment (June 2025).</p> <p>3.38 The Council has commissioned a Heritage Impact Assessment relating to the site. This says that its analysis was based on the Vision Document for the site (at Appendix G) (as the Masterplan for the site had not been prepared at that time). Our Regulation 19 representations are supported by a Heritage Assessment of the site prepared by Cogent Heritage (Appendix E).</p> <p>3.39 A summary table showing the respective positions on the potential level of ‘harm’ that could be caused to the various heritage assets at and around the site is set out in the table below.</p> <p>3.40 There is some degree of difference between the Council’s Impact Assessment and that prepared by Cogent Heritage, but the differences are not very significant. These are likely to be explained for the most part by that the Council’s Report was based on the Vision Document (which</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
											has been significantly enhanced at Masterplan stage with regard the relationship with heritage assets) and that Place Services (who prepared the report for the Council) was not aware of the significant mitigation that is proposed as part of the Masterplan scheme, including substantial areas of landscape buffer planting. 3.41 In fact, the Masterplan scheme would cause no harm to designated heritage assets at or around the site, and low levels of harm to two non-designated assets within proximity of the site. Heritage should be regarded as no impediment to the allocation of this site for development, subject to appropriate design mitigation being secured. Drafting within a site allocation policy, or the Council's 'Development Management' policy relating to heritage would secure this at planning application stage. Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Outline Landscape Appraisal (2024). 3.42 The Council's Landscape Sensitivity Assessment considers South of Hadleigh in two parcels. The eastern part of the site is referred to as 'GB8a' and the western part								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											<p>of the site is 'GB8b'.</p> <p>3.43 Whilst the Assessment concludes that GB8b has a medium to low landscape sensitivity, it considers GB8a to have high landscape sensitivity. This is described as being because of views and the setting of Hadleigh Castle, existing vegetated field boundaries and open and long distance views across the estuary.</p> <p>3.44 It is important to note that the authors of this Assessment will not have had sight of the Masterplan for the site, which has been developed in close collaboration with Aspect Landscape, as consultants to the project. A Landscape and Visual Technical Note is provided at Appendix D.</p> <p>3.45 The Masterplan design has been carefully developed to include strategically positioned 'viewing corridors' (areas of open green space, providing views southwards through the site towards the Estuary). These, taken together with extensive landscape buffer planting, would mitigate any harmful landscape impacts associated with developing the site.</p> <p>3.50 We consider that the scoring displayed in the SLAA is quite arbitrary and difficult to understand. Had</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
											the criteria been scored more appropriately and transparently, the overall score would have been much nearer to the ‘maximum’ score of 82. 3.51 The SLAA concludes that it is unknown whether the site is developable or suitable. It clearly is both. It is also noteworthy that the density range shown for the site (between 1907 and 3179 units) is far higher than has been achieved through a detailed Master planning process, where a quantum of around 900 homes is shown. It is not clear where those much higher figures have arisen from or whether they have informed the scoring given to the site.								
1002-0004	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	SP3	No	The Regulation 19 consultation has not been undertaken properly, with two materially different versions of the Local Plan on the Council's website, and important documents added to the document library midway through the consultation period.	No	Positively prepared	Castle Point is not entitled to have taken the strategic approach that it has to the delivery of homes. The result is a Plan that advocates the delivery of around half of the homes that are actually needed (with reference to the Standard Method). – The Council’s justification for having taken this		Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		The Regulation 19 consultation has not been undertaken properly, with two materially different versions of the Local Plan on the Council's website, and important documents added to the document	Consultation was re-started to address the procedural concern regarding two versions. <u>Housing Supply – Government Housing Target and Standard method</u> Through robust	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
											<p>approach is not convincing and does not withstand scrutiny (for example, the suggestion that all Green Belt sites are unsustainable, when the Council's evidence base shows that GB8 is sustainably located).</p> <p>–The Council will need to release Green Belt land for development to provide enough homes.</p> <p>–The starting point in that process should be to release land that qualifies as ‘Grey belt’. South of Hadleigh (GB8) is Grey Belt for the reasons described in these representations.</p> <p>–The Council's Sustainability Appraisal Annexes (July 2025) confirms that the site has good public transport links and accessibility (pg. 579), has good access to local services (pg. 630 and is well served by health services (pg. 745).</p> <p>–Contrary to the evidence presented by the Council, there would be no heritage or landscape harms arising from the allocation of the site for development that could not be mitigated through detailed design.</p> <p>–This mitigation is reflected in the Masterplan for the site, which shows how around 900 homes could come forward, alongside a new Employment Training</p>						<p>library midway through the consultation period.</p> <p>Perceived under-delivery of housing.</p> <p>Argues Site GB8 should have been allocated.</p>	<p>technical evidence as outlined in the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025, CPBC has identified through a housing strategy of urban intensification and regeneration sufficient sites to 6,196 homes through the planned period.</p> <p>CPBC realises that this is considerably less housing than the Standard Method housing need but considers based on the evidence that this is a realistic housing delivery</p> <p>Castle Point's approach to the site review is outlined within the Housing Capacity Topic Paper August 2025.</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
											Centre and Rare Breeds Farm. –These proposals would help to deliver the Mission of the Salvation Army, through the delivery of high-quality new extension to Hadleigh that is respectful of its neighbours and contributes towards the local community. –As currently prepared, the Castle Point Plan is not sound and it should be revisited, so as to include the allocation of land at Hadleigh.								
1002-0005	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	Policies Map	No	The Regulation 19 consultation has not been undertaken properly, with two materially different versions of the Local Plan on the Council's website, and important documents added to the document library midway through the consultation period.	No	Positively prepared		5.4 With regard the Draft Policies Map, we have the following additional observations: –The location of the listed, and locally listed buildings are not accurate. –The key is not accurate for the Hadleigh Country Park, Hadleigh Farm, and Benfleet Southend Marches. Diagonal on the key but hatched on the plan. –Scheduled ancient monument key does not match the colour on the plan. Beige on key, and red on plan.	Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		Error in public consultation  With regard the Draft Policies Map, we have the following additional observations: –The location of the listed, and locally listed buildings are not accurate. –The key is not accurate for the Hadleigh Country Park, Hadleigh Farm, and Benfleet Southend Marches. Diagonal on the key but hatched on the plan. –Scheduled ancient monument key does not match the colour on the plan. Beige on key, and red on plan.	Acknowledged by the council and a second regulation 19 consultation was undertaken to address this issue.  The data used for the policies map was sourced from Historic England and Essex County Council. A general review of the styling of the map has been added to the mods list.	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1002-0006	Agent	Nik	Smith	The Salvation Army c/o Nexus Planning	Yes	HAD2	No	The Regulation 19 consultation has not been undertaken properly, with two materially different versions of the Local Plan on the Council's website, and important documents added to the document library midway through the consultation period.	No	Positively prepared	5. 1 For the reasons described, we do not consider the draft Plan sound and do not support Policy Had2. We recognise that it broadly supports the provision of recreational, agricultural and training uses but it does not provide for much needed new homes at the site.	5.2 In addition, there is a typographic error or Part 2 of the Policy ('where they do not have a significant impact on the landscape [or] the Green belt], which we request is corrected. 5.3 Further, paragraph 10.20 of the supporting text says that 'it is therefore critical that any development allowed does not have an impact on the landscape'. Any scheme will have some level of impact on any landscape. This drafting should be revised to read 'any development allowed should not have a significant impact on the landscape'. That would reflect the language used in the main body of the Policy.	Not Answered	Not Answered	Yes		Broadly supports the premis of Policy HAD2 but does not support the lack of allowance for homes on this site.  Highlights typo at paragraph 5.2 In addition, there is a typographic error or Part 2 of the Policy ('where they do not have a significant impact on the landscape [or] the Green belt], which we request is corrected.	This site has not been allocated for residential development due4 to a number of constraints including Green Belt allocation, Environmental, Historical aspect. More information on this can be found in the evidence base documents, specifically the hadleigh heritage impact assessment and the housing capacity topic paper.  See modifications to address typo highlighted.	10.2 It is therefore critical that any development allowed <b>should not have a significant impact</b> on the landscape. Furthermore, it is important that any recreational or farming activities are compatible with the nature conservation status of the area.
0268-0001	Organisation	Michelle	Smith	The Warehouse Bar	Yes	B8	No	I am a local business on the Manor Trading Estate and have had a presence on the estate for years. 1st I record that I have had the opportunity to read and fully understand my neighbour "G&K	No	Not Stated	Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning. I am certainly more confused now! Where am I going to be re-homed? This Regulation 19 along with the recent green belt review		No	Not Stated	Yes, attached is G&K Ground work		The regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. CPBC have never engaged with the business community on this estate.	Policy B8 part 6 states 'A programme of renewal of the industrial and commercial building stock within the estate	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First 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
								Groundworks Ltd” Unsound submission. For clarity I attach a copy of G&Ks submission to this e-mail. I record here that The Warehouse Bar agree with G&K Groundworks Ltd.’s that the regulation 19 draft as presented is Unsound. For the record and as relayed in G&K Groundworks Ltd submission • CPBC have never engaged with me / my business about our future on this estate. • Have never informed as is on the council’s regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough • I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property!			indicates that the area North where we are moving to has been identified as GB16 and has been discounted as it is not a viable! Option. I would like to record my total disbelief that CPBC along with our local councillors think it’s OK to treat us the MTE business community with total disrespect. Suffice – I record again that this draft plan is unsound as it has not engaged with the business on the MTE at all. Albeit we are the drivers of the local economy. Perhaps CPBC might remove that Regeneration Priority Frightening Statement and actually support the local business. Please ensure that this unsound submission is recorded and registered correctly.				s ltd's response to the consultation		Have never informed as is on the council’s regeneration web page at priority No 4 that CPBC intends to build houses on the Manor Trading Estate and move all the businesses on the MTE North of the Borough I presume CPBC intends to compulsorily purchase my operational property! Again, I have not been consulted at all this is very worrying and concerning.	with the overall aim of an increase in floor space of at least 10%'  Paragraph 9.28 states ' It is not the intention of the Master Plan to result in a loss of employment on this site. Overall, the Master Plan should seek a modest increase in the floor space available for industrial and commercial uses to support economic growth. This will be secured through the revised approach to design and parking.'	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0329-0001	Organisation	Ben	Green	The Woodland Trust		ENV 1		The Woodland Trust welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Castle Point Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan. As the UK's leading woodland conservation charity, our mission is to protect and restore ancient woodland, increase native tree cover, and inspire people to enjoy and value woods and trees. These priorities are rooted in tackling the twin crises of climate change and biodiversity loss, while creating healthier and more resilient places for people and wildlife. We commend Castle Point Borough Council for producing a Local Plan with clear ambitions to enhance biodiversity, strengthen green infrastructure, and address climate resilience.				However, to ensure that the Plan delivers genuine nature recovery and meets the challenges ahead, we recommend strengthening several policies to better protect irreplaceable habitats, deliver higher environmental gains, and embed long-term tree strategy objectives. This response sets out detailed comments on key policy areas, structured around Woodland Trust priorities. 1. Vision and Objectives The Plan's vision to make Castle Point the "green heart of South Essex" is laudable, particularly the ambition to deliver multifunctional green infrastructure, connected habitats, and climate-adapted development. Environmental objectives (Obj 2, Obj 3, Obj 4) set a strong foundation, but to ensure these are actionable we recommend: • Embedding measurable canopy cover and biodiversity indicators, aligned with our Tree Strategy Template's call for a seven per cent canopy increase over 16 years and a 30 per cent canopy cover target for all new developments. • Explicitly committing to bigger, better, and more joined-up habitats in line with the Lawton principles, referencing the Essex Local Nature Recovery				A	We commend Castle Point Borough Council for producing a Local Plan with clear ambitions to enhance biodiversity, strengthen green infrastructure, and address climate resilience. However, to ensure that the Plan delivers genuine nature recovery and meets the challenges ahead, we recommend strengthening several policies to better protect irreplaceable habitats, deliver higher environmental gains, and embed long-term tree strategy objectives.	Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												<p>Strategy (LNRS). • Introducing a specific objective to protect and restore ancient woodland and veteran trees. 2. Biodiversity Net Gain (Policy ENV3) Castle Point proposes a 10 per cent Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for brownfield sites and 20 per cent for greenfield sites. This is encouraging, but to maximise ecological benefit: The Woodland Trust calls for: 2 • A minimum of 20 per cent BNG across all sites, not just greenfield, to reflect emerging best practice and ensure consistent nature recovery. • 50 years' maintenance and monitoring of BNG sites, recognising the decades required for woodland habitats to mature. • Clear exclusion of ancient woodland and veteran trees from net gain calculations, in line with the Planners' Manual's recognition that loss of irreplaceable habitats always results in net biodiversity loss. We also support the use of the Urban Greening Factor (0.3 for major commercial and 0.4 for major residential schemes) but recommend expanding this into a Tree Equity Approach,<sup>1</sup> ensuring greening efforts prioritise deprived and low-canopy areas, as outlined in the Tree Strategy Template. 3.</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
												Protection of Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees (Policy ENV1 & ENV3) The Plan correctly identifies ancient woodland as an irreplaceable habitat and references NPPF protections. However, stronger policy wording is essential: The Woodland Trust calls for: • Explicit adoption of the recommended NPPF policy wording (paragraph 193, subsection c): “Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons”. • Recognition that compensation cannot offset loss of ancient woodland or veteran trees. • Buffer zones: at least 50 metres for ancient woodland and 15x trunk diameter (or 5m beyond canopy) for veteran trees. • A proactive programme of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) for all ancient and veteran trees, and expansion of the Ancient Tree Inventory.2 4. Tree Strategy and Canopy Cover Castle Point’s Plan recognises green infrastructure but lacks a comprehensive tree strategy. We recommend integrating a 16-year Tree and Woodland Action Plan,							

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												following our Tree Strategy Template: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 per cent canopy cover target for all new developments and 25 per cent canopy cover on council land by year 12.</li> <li>• Tree-lined streets as standard, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 136.</li> <li>• Mandatory use of UK and Ireland Sourced and Grown (UKISG)3 trees from appropriate seed zones.</li> <li>• Creation of local tree nurseries to strengthen biosecurity and provide local employment.</li> <li>• Adoption of Tree Equity Mapping to guide planting in deprived or low-canopy areas.</li> </ul> 5. Hedgerows and Habitat Networks While hedgerows are noted in landscape policies, a dedicated hedgerow policy is required to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 <a href="https://uk.treeequityscore.org/">https://uk.treeequityscore.org/</a></li> <li>2 <a href="https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/">https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/</a></li> <li>3 <a href="https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/we-plant-trees/uk-sourced-and-grown-scheme/">https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/we-plant-trees/uk-sourced-and-grown-scheme/</a></li> </ol> <li>• Recognise ancient hedgerows as irreplaceable features.</li> <li>• Apply a 10:1 replacement ratio for non-ancient hedgerow losses.</li> <li>• Require native, UKISG-compliant species for hedgerow planting and restoration.</li> 6. Coastal, Landscape and Green Infrastructure Policies							

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												(ENV1 & ENV2) We support the Plan's ambition to protect Castle Point's distinctive landscapes and coastal habitats. To strengthen delivery: • Embed woodland and hedgerow connectivity into landscape assessments. • Integrate ecological corridors into the proposed Riverside Strategy. • Require nature-based solutions (e.g., wet woodland creation, riparian buffers) for climate resilience. 7. Monitoring and Enforcement A robust monitoring framework is essential to ensure policies translate into outcomes. We recommend: • Establishing a central database to track tree planting, canopy cover, and BNG delivery. • Annual public reporting on BNG compliance, canopy cover changes, and habitat connectivity. • Enforcement mechanisms for long-term stewardship of BNG and tree planting sites. Summary of Recommendations 1. BNG: Minimum 20 per cent across all sites, with 50-year management. 2. Canopy Cover: 30 per cent in new developments, 25 per cent on council land, with tree-lined streets. 3. Ancient Woodland & Veteran Trees: Adopt NPPF 193c policy wording; apply buffer standards; expand TPOs and Ancient Tree Inventory. 4.							

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
												Tree Strategy: Implement a 16-year Tree and Woodland Action Plan with UKISG trees, local nurseries, and equity mapping. 5. Hedgerows: Introduce a dedicated policy with strong protection and replacement standards. 6. Landscape & Coastal Policies: Strengthen ecological connectivity and nature-based climate solutions. 7. Monitoring: Establish centralised data, annual reporting, and enforcement mechanisms.							
0329-0002	Organisation	Ben	Green	The Woodland Trust		Vision & objectives											1. Vision and Objectives The Plan's vision to make Castle Point the "green heart of South Essex" is laudable, particularly the ambition to deliver multifunctional green infrastructure, connected habitats, and climate-adapted development. Environmental objectives (Obj 2, Obj 3, Obj 4) set a	It is considered that these matters are already covered indirectly or by other means.  Policy ENV3(d)(iii) commits to 'An urban greening factor score of 0.3 for all major commercial development proposals and 0.4 for all major residential development	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
																	<p>strong foundation, but to ensure these are actionable we recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Embedding measurable canopy cover and biodiversity indicators, aligned with our Tree Strategy</li> <li>Template's call for a seven per cent canopy increase over 16 years and a 30 per cent canopy cover target for all new developments.</li> <li>• Explicitly committing to bigger, better, and more joined-up habitats in line with the Lawton principles, referencing the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).</li> <li>• Introducing a specific objective to protect and restore ancient woodland and veteran trees.</li> </ul>	<p>proposals, in line with the model Urban Greening Factor for England;'</p> <p>Policy ENV3(c) commits to 'Conserving and <i>enhancing the network</i> of protected species, priority species or <i>priority habitats in accordance with their status</i> and give appropriate weight to their importance' (Italics our emphasis to indicate elements where the comment is covered)</p> <p>Commitments to the LRS are embedded throughout the plan and embedded in multiple policies, including ENV4, C1, C4, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B4, B7, B8, B9, Had1, Had2, Had 3, Thun 2, DH1, E1, ENV2)</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
0329-0003	Organisation	Ben	Green	The Woodland Trust		ENV 3											<p>2. Biodiversity Net Gain (Policy ENV3) Castle Point proposes a 10 per cent Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for brownfield sites and 20 per cent for greenfield sites. This is encouraging, but to maximise ecological benefit: The Woodland Trust calls for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of 20 per cent BNG across all sites, not just greenfield, to reflect emerging best practice and ensure consistent nature recovery.</li> <li>• 50 years' maintenance and monitoring of BNG sites, recognising the decades required for woodland habitats to mature.</li> <li>• Clear exclusion of ancient woodland and veteran trees from net gain calculations, in line with the Planners' Manual's recognition that loss of irreplaceable habitats always results in net</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted. Mods proposed in relation to Woodland Trust's third bullet.</p> <p><b>18:20 As set out in the NPPF, development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons. In line with the regulations, such irreplaceable habitats are also excluded from biodiversity net gain calculations since it is recognised that loss of irreplaceable habitats always results in net biodiversity loss. Biodiversity net</b></p>	Y

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>biodiversity loss.</p> <p>We also support the use of the Urban Greening Factor (0.3 for major commercial and 0.4 for major residential schemes) but recommend expanding this into a Tree Equity Approach, ensuring greening efforts prioritise deprived and low-canopy areas, as outlined in the Tree Strategy Template.</p> <p>Also call for a programme of monitoring and enforcement.</p> <p>Protection of Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees (Policy ENV1 &amp; ENV3) The Plan correctly identifies ancient woodland as an irreplaceable habitat and references NPPF protections. However, stronger policy wording is essential: The Woodland Trust calls for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explicit adoption</li> </ul>	gain should be subject to maintenance and monitoring for at least 30 years.	

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 recommended NPPF policy wording (paragraph 193, subsection c): “Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Recognition that compensation cannot offset loss of ancient woodland or veteran trees.</li><li>• Buffer zones: at least 50 metres for ancient woodland and 15x trunk diameter (or 5m beyond canopy) for veteran trees.</li><li>• A proactive programme of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) for all ancient and veteran trees, and expansion of the Ancient Tree Inventory.</li></ul>		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0329-0004	Organisation	Ben	Green	The Woodland Trust		ENV1											<b>Tree Strategy and Canopy Cover</b> Castle Point's Plan recognises green infrastructure but lacks a comprehensive tree strategy. We recommend integrating a 16-year Tree and Woodland Action Plan, following our Tree Strategy Template: • 30 per cent canopy cover target for all new developments and 25 per cent canopy cover on council land by year 12. • Tree-lined streets as standard, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 136. • Mandatory use of UK and Ireland Sourced and Grown (UKISG)3 trees from appropriate seed zones. • Creation of local tree nurseries to strengthen biosecurity and provide local employment. • Adoption of Tree Equity Mapping to guide planting in	It should be noted that Policy D4(3) already requires new streets to be tree lined.  Policy ENV3(d)(iii) commits to 'An urban greening factor score of 0.3 for all major commercial development proposals and 0.4 for all major residential development proposals, in line with the model Urban Greening Factor for England;'	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	<p>deprived or low-canopy areas.</p> <p><b>Hedgerows and Habitat Networks</b></p> <p>While hedgerows are noted in landscape policies, a dedicated hedgerow policy is required to:</p> <p>1  <a href="https://uk.treeequityscore.org/">https://uk.treeequityscore.org/</a></p> <p>2  <a href="https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/">https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/</a></p> <p>3  <a href="https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/we-plant-trees/uk-sourced-and-grown-scheme/">https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/we-plant-trees/uk-sourced-and-grown-scheme/</a></p> <p>3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise ancient hedgerows as irreplaceable features.</li> <li>• Apply a 10:1 replacement ratio for non-ancient hedgerow losses.</li> <li>• Require native, UKISG-compliant species for hedgerow planting and restoration.</li> </ul>		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
0329-0005	Organisation	Ben	Green	The Woodland Trust		ENV2											<b>Coastal, Landscape and Green Infrastructure Policies (ENV1 &amp; ENV2)</b> We support the Plan's ambition to protect Castle Point's distinctive landscapes and coastal habitats. To strengthen delivery: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Embed woodland and hedgerow connectivity into landscape assessments.</li> <li>• Integrate ecological corridors into the proposed Riverside Strategy.</li> <li>• Require nature-based solutions (e.g., wet woodland creation, riparian buffers) for climate resilience.</li> </ul>	Policy D4 Landscaping is explicit that trees, native species and integrated habitats are important. Policy ENV2 is clear that Development proposals must be designed to enable and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities set out in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).  <u>Modification to Policy ENV1(2)</u>  Policy ENV1(2) Development proposals should seek to protect, <del>and</del> enhance <b>and increase the connectivity of</b> key natural/semi-natural and historical features including:	Y - Modification to Policy ENV1(2)  Policy ENV1(2) Development proposals should seek to protect, and enhance and increase the connectivity of key natural/semi-natural and historical features including:

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 Com plia nt?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. So und?	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 supplie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d
105 6-000 1	Agent	.	.	Thorney Bay Park Limited c/o Laister Planning Limited	Yes	Policies Map	No	The Local Plan proposes to designate the south-western corner of Thorney Bay/Sandy Bay Caravan Park for both 'Park Homes' and 'Green Lung'. As set out in our letter submitted to these representations, the land has been used for the stationing of static caravans or ancillary purposes associated with the caravan site for almost twenty years. It serves no purpose as a 'Green Lung' as it contains static caravans and maintenance yard. The Proposals Map should be updated accordingly to remove the 'Green Lung' designation and retain the 'Park Homes' designation only. Otherwise, the Local Plan is unjustified and ineffective - and therefore 'unsound' - without further amendment.	No	Effective, Justified	As set out above, the Proposals Map seeks to designate the south-western part of Sandy Bay/Thorney Bay Caravan Park as both a 'Green Lung' and 'Park Homes'. its long standing use is for caravan site (static caravans) and purposes ancillary to the use of the site as a caravan site. The 'Green Lung' designation is incompatible with that long-standing use and therefore the Proposals Map is both unjustified and ineffective, and therefore unsound. To correct it, the 'Green Lung' designation should be removed from this part of the caravan park, and this land should only be designated 'Park Homes' alongside the wider caravan site.	As set out above, the Proposals Map seeks to designate the south-western part of Sandy Bay/Thorney Bay Caravan Park as both a 'Green Lung' and 'Park Homes'. its long standing use is for caravan site (static caravans) and purposes ancillary to the use of the site as a caravan site. The 'Green Lung' designation is incompatible with that long-standing use and therefore the Proposals Map is both unjustified and ineffective, and therefore unsound. To correct it, the 'Green Lung' designation should be removed from this part of the caravan park, and this land should only be designated 'Park Homes' alongside the wider caravan site	No	Not Answered	Yes	C	Remove the green lung designation from the south-western part of Sandy Bay/Thorney Bay Caravan Park.	This designation is considered necessary to safeguard the strategically important ecological corridor.	N
033 7-000 1	Organisation	Alex	Savine	Thurrock Council		SP3	Not Stated	Thurrock recognises the heavily constrained planning context that Castle Point Council contends with, being only 17 square miles in area and covered with numerous environmental designations including Ramsar Sites, Special Protection Areas, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Ancient Woodland and Flood Risk Zone 3b. The combined constraints map shows that around 1,824ha of the Borough's Green Belt			At this stage we wish to reiterate that we are currently unable to confirm whether Thurrock Council can assist with meeting unmet housing need in Castle Point. As part of our work on the new Thurrock Local Plan 2024-2044, we are undertaking a review of our own Green Belt and Grey Belt areas within the Borough. In addition, we are mid-way through our own site assessment process to determine whether					A	TC is currently working on its new Thurrock Local Plan 2024 – 2044 and is reviewing its Green Belt and Grey Belt areas as well as assessing sites to ascertain whether it can meet its own housing needs. Consequently, at this moment TC is unable to confirm whether it can assist CPBC in	TC agrees that Castle Point faces notable physical and environment constraints to growth and TC has no objections to CPBC's approach to addressing housing need. Both CPBC and TC agree to continue to work	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. Sounded?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								is constrained by footnote 7 constraints or is otherwise constrained by nature conservation constraints or open space constraints. No sites within the Green Belt have been identified as potential site allocations within the Draft Local Plan, and as a result only 53% of the Standard Method figure of 11,662 homes has been met through the proposed allocations, comprising existing commitments, urban allocations and windfall sites. Thurrock Council do not wish to object to the Council's approach to addressing housing need within the Borough. We note that a design-based capacity assessment has been undertaken by Place Services to maximise density on the urban sites proposed for allocation within the Draft Plan.			Thurrock has sufficient housing and employment land to meet its own needs. This process is anticipated to be complete early in 2026, and we welcome further discussion with Castle Point at that stage.						meeting its unmet housing need.	collaboratively through SEC to address CPBC and other authority areas' unmet housing need within South Essex, while recognising the significant constraints that each of these authority areas face in meeting that need	
0337-0002	Organisation	Alex	Savine	Thurrock Council		C5	Yes	During consultation on the Regulation 18 Castle Point Local Plan, Thurrock Council previously raised an objection to Castle Point's proposal for a Canvey Island (Northwick Road) to Thurrock (A1014 Manorway) road link on grounds of impact on landscape, SSSI, SPAs and highways. Concerns centred on the impact on local communities along the Manorway and the	Yes								TC notes that CPBC intends to prepare a feasibility study (Policy C5) to explore options and welcomes further discussion to provide for better access to and from Canvey Island	CPBC and TC agree to collaborate on the feasibility work to explore the options for better access to and from Canvey Island.	N



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First 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
								junction of Manorway with A13. At the time of the Regulation 18 consultation, no evidence was provided to justify the scheme in terms of highway modelling, programming, funding, phasing or delivery, nor was there an environmental appraisal of the proposal. We note that the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan has not included this scheme. Instead, Policy C5 commits the Council to undertaking a feasibility study to identify options for improving access to, from and within Canvey Island, including its wider strategic implications. The policy wording clarifies it will be developed in collaboration with ECC and adjoining authorities among others and will undergo Habitat Regulations Assessment. Thurrock Council welcomes this approach and is willing to engage in future discussions on this matter.											
0337-0003	Organisation	Alex	Savine	Thurrock Council		SD4	Yes	Thurrock Council welcomes the inclusion of Policy SD4 (Net Zero Carbon in Operation) requiring new development within the borough to be ultra-low energy buildings, fossil fuel free, and generate renewable energy on-site to at least match annual energy use.	Yes								TC supports the Net Zero Carbon Development policies SD4 In operation and SD5 Embodied Carbon as policies that represent a substantial step in addressing climate change across South Essex and	CPBC and TC agree that it is appropriate to pursue a Climate Responsive Design approach in their respective local plans, while acknowledging that detailed policy in the	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
																	providing certainty and clarity to developers.	Thurrock Local Plan will be subject to confirmation of evidence and testing.	
0337-0004	Organisation	Alex	Savine	Thurrock Council		SD5	Yes	Similarly, the inclusion of Policy SD5 (Embodied Carbon) follows, requiring Whole Life Cycle Carbon Assessments. These policies are considered to be a substantial positive step in addressing climate change which requires all authorities to act. Progressing with a similar policy stance across Greater Essex will ensure a coordinated approach by Local Planning Authorities to this cross-boundary issue and provides clarity and certainty for the development industry on energy standards and planning application submission requirements.	Yes								TC supports the Net Zero Carbon Development policies SD4 In operation and SD5 Embodied Carbon as policies that represent a substantial step in addressing climate change across South Essex and providing certainty and clarity to developers.	CPBC and TC agree that it is appropriate to pursue a Climate Responsive Design approach in their respective local plans, while acknowledging that detailed policy in the Thurrock Local Plan will be subject to confirmation of evidence and testing.	N
0337-0005	Organisation	Alex	Savine	Thurrock Council		ENV4	Yes	Similarly, Thurrock Council endorses the inclusion of direct reference to the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy within Policy ENV4 (Local Wildlife and Geological Sites) requiring development proposals to be designed to enable and support the habitat priority measures identified within the Strategic Opportunities, and to ensure areas that are identified as an Area of Particular Importance for	Yes								TC supports Policy ENV4 and the direct reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy requiring development proposals to have regard for and protect strategically important areas of biodiversity.	CPBC and TC agree to enable and support biodiversity opportunities through their local plans.	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								Biodiversity (APIBs) are protected. Given the novel nature of the LNRS's the wording of this policy takes a proportionate approach that seeks to improve biodiversity without limiting development proposals from coming forward.											
1442-0001	Individual	Wendy	Keith		Not Stated	SP3	Not Stated	No no no to the plans. We have so many homes already being built the island is getting too big with just one road. That's what you should do for the island is give us the second road not more homes. We can't even get off the island for our hospital appointments or get anywhere cos you can't get off the island. So no we don't want no more homes .	Not Stated								No to more homes on Canvey. Only one road access.	Noted. The plan has been subject to detailed Transport Assessment, assessing impacts and recommending local interventions. These are identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Alongside this, the Local Transport Authority, Essex County Council, have prepared the Essex Local Transport Plan 4, which within the Implementation Plan for South Essex includes wider local improvements to transport networks in and around Castle Point, including improved linkages to other	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
																		areas. Growth in Castle Point will facilitate the delivery of the proposals in the Local Transport Plan 4.	
1443-0001	Individual	Philip	Bostock		Not Stated	SP3	Not Stated	To suggest building 757 homes on every available car park and space in Hadleigh is plainly daft. No point saying that it's not been agreed. Even putting it forward is not sensible. If you are driven by dark forces or mental disturbance you need to get a grip, push back, act rationally.				There is open land east of Hadleigh, south of the A13. It's a poor place to put houses as it just adds to the congestion of the area. But it's still better than your 'plan'. But it's green belt. A million times better than the 'grey belt' car parks. Please try harder.					There is open land east of Hadleigh, south of the A13. It's a poor place to put houses as it just adds to the congestion of the area. But it's still better than your 'plan'. But it's green belt. A million times better than the 'grey belt' car parks.	Noted	N
1444-0001	Individual	Barbara	Parker			SP3	Not Stated	To whom it may concern, As a resident for 50 years in this area, I strongly object to the underhand methods by the current Labour Government changing designated 'Green Belt' to so called 'Grey Belt' areas. It is all part of the plan to weaken local views by putting parts of Essex together and delaying local elections. The Government expect the people of Essex to comply to their agenda and increase the population of this county against the wishes of it's residents. Our MP Rebecca Harris is fighting this cause and I fully support her. If British citizens are having 1.41 children, additional housing	Not Stated								To whom it may concern, As a resident for 50 years in this area, I strongly object to the underhand methods by the current Labour Government changing designated 'Green Belt' to so called 'Grey Belt' areas. It is all part of the plan to weaken local views by putting parts of Essex together and delaying local elections. The Government expect the people of Essex	Noted	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
								is not necessary. It is a con and part of an irreversible plan if it is allowed to go ahead. It would change the county irreparably.									to comply to their agenda and increase the population of this county against the wishes of it's residents. Our MP Rebecca Harris is fighting this cause and I fully support her. If British citizens are having 1.41 children, additional housing is not necessary. It is a con and part of an irreversible plan if it is allowed to go ahead. It would change the county irreparably.		
1445-0001	Individual	Frances	Reading			SP3	No	That your plan is unsound and illegal we don't need more houses canvey is over populated now	No								That your plan is unsound and illegal we don't need more houses canvey is over populated now	Noted	N
1446-0001	Individual	John	Butt			SP3	Not Stated	Canvey Island butchered again. Massive development with on infrastructure. Just as always. Canvey Island the dumping ground for what castle point does not want. Always has been since the formation of Castle point. I have lived on Canvey Island [REDACTED] and watched it's destruction since castle point was formed.	Not Stated								Canvey Island butchered again. Massive development with on infrastructure. Just as always. Canvey Island the dumping ground for what castle point does not want. Always has been since the formation of Castle point. I have lived on Canvey Island [REDACTED] and watched it's destruction since	Infrastructure: Infrastructure matters are covered by policies INFRA1-6 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	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
																	castle point was formed.		
1447-0001	<b>Second Response - Please see Rep 1440</b>																		
1448-0001	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular Architecture	Not Stated	D1	Not Stated	This consultation feedback submission has been produced by Mr. David Richard Barton, also known as Community Campaigner David Barton who is promoting both the existing Built Historic Environment and Traditional Vernacular Architecture (TVA)/ Traditional Architecture (TA) as a key feature across UK and Ireland-wide Local Authorities and associated Planning Departments at all tiers of Local, Regional and Central Government. This universal consultation therefore acts as an official Representation at all and any stage of official area UK Planning Consultations- Preliminary Scoping Documents, Named Stages of the Local Plan, Conservation Area Appraisals and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), primarily regarding Design Codes. Representations are being made by Mr. Barton as part of his ongoing work to champion the key stakeholders at various key	Not Stated		SECTION 1: Design Codes:- 1. Design Codes based on TVA should be utilised in preference to Design Guides 2. LAs should establish recurring partnerships with key Consultation Bodies, such as Create Streets and The King's Foundation, etc who specialise in getting through to a huge swathe of grassroots members of the public with tried and tested previous experience in Local Plans, such as Lichfield, etc. 3. Non-demolition of historic buildings prior to the 1950s must be made policy or adhered to as part of LCC's commitment to combatting the Climate Crisis through sequestering carbon in its Old Builds. 4. LAs should adopt a Local List of Valued Buildings (Non-designated Heritage Assets), which have been a Government requirement since the policy introduction through the NPPF in 2012. Historic England produced a guide to help Councils in May 2012. Bristol produced an		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Emphasises prioritising TVA design codes over guides, building recurring partnerships with consultation bodies, and preventing demolition of pre-1950s buildings to support climate goals. Calls for adoption of local lists of valued non-designated heritage assets, identification of existing action plans, and more flexible consultation processes. Strong focus on retaining and restoring Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian architecture, requiring new builds to use historic styles and local materials. Encourages local suppliers, artisan skills, volunteer	Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								<p>areas old and new with a view to supporting their economic growth through the merits of High-Quality style Conservation with the hope of encouraging wider constructive and restorative support through positive and constructive working. It is submitted that TVA should play a key part in any and all policy moving forwards on the grounds of conferring practical benefits be these periodic maintenance, their perceived support from the public, their invaluable contribution to achieving Climate Crisis Targets set local, nationally and internationally alongside their overall cost-effectiveness to key stakeholders alike in terms of Planning and sourcing of raw materials.</p> <p>*One primary document that should be considered with significance especially alongside my own representation is a written academic account of the actual practicalities associated with Traditional Architecture from a leading expert in their field.i.) Not only does this in-depth analysis provide an in-depth take on the widely assorted merits of this type of Architecture but it fully corroborates my case made across all sections typically</p>			<p>exemplar list in 2015, which is well worth reviewing.</p> <p>5. Existing Action Plan if present for Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets needs identifying and/ or establishing (I may support this if invited).</p> <p>6. Option for people to provide feedback even if out of time for additional documents, such as SPDs or at the discretion of Councils where feedback may be particularly assistive or lead to additional academic and architect guidance. Option for public publishing of feedback should be encouraged with the consultee's consent to encourage wider consultation uptake moving forwards.</p> <p>7. Era-style Buildings, especially rows of Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian architecture must be faithfully restored, retained and recreated to complement surrounding historic streets that may or may not be classed in official Conservation Areas preventing harsh contrast with newer built housing estates from the 1950s onwards.</p> <p>8. Where demolition is proposed for 1950s style housing onwards- any new construction must be in the historic building style and</p>						assemblies, and streamlined planning processes. Where mixed eras exist, the predominant historic style should be used.		



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 und?	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
								found in one of the consultations highlighted above. Furthermore, my representations to date and contained herein this document are duly supported by the Founder and Director of The Institute for Traditional Architectureii.) who has identified and recognised my own contribution(s) to communities up and down the Sefton Borough. This is an internationally acclaimed organisation which periodically works with other leading agencies and organisations to bring about effective positive change. Page 5 of 18 Outlined throughout Submission are responses to existing Consultations which set out why I consider amendments to existing Planning Policy documents are necessary to ensure the best possible outcomes. References to supporting documents are contained in the indented blue numbering. This Submission has been prepared for UK and Ireland-wide Local Authorities in the hope that it may serve as an umbrella representation by Mr. Barton. This does not prejudice his ability to also			local materials to ensure high carbon capacity, quality aesthetic and true blending of the interconnected conurbations of any one area, place or location. 9. Concerted efforts to identify and locate core suppliers for raw materials and specific heritage skills should encourage new uptake of these limited artisan craft skills by new contractors locally based to support the local economy, provide employment, and reduce the cost of product and service in the long-term. 10. Volunteer labouring assemblies should be fully encouraged and supported identifying key individual an group skillsets that can be utilised to protect historic buildings or areas at risk with a view to supporting the construction of new authentic style housing (as and where appropriate) and the reconstruction of demolished Page 9 of 18 prized old buildings beloved by the community, such as community pubs, libraries and community centres. 11. Simplified streamlined Planning Process for key stakeholders either working to authentically restore buildings and/ or build new ones, such as observed								



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
								comment on live stages of any one Consultation, merely providing the ability to be put in touch directly with any one Local Authority in receipt of this Representation with the prospect of also taking part in any version(s) of Consultations begin ran by said Local Authorities. If there are future consultations, especially regarding Design Codes and SPDs relating to this across both designated and non-designated heritage assets then it is hoped that these are duly provided to Community Campaigner David Barton. Mr. Barton has cited material references and sources from his previous Representation to the Bootle Area Action Plan Consultation (2021-2026) that align with his existing and ongoing points which he would like to raise in parallel with other Local Authorities. Where a more detailed discussion with leading sources, such as Architects and Academics may prove conducive with these Councils then Mr. Barton would be delighted to discuss this further. Community Campaigner David Barton: Community Campaigner David Barton is a Heritage Campaigner of over 11			with many civic buildings in Budapest Hungary and the Federal University Buildings in the US. 12. Where there have been evolving building styles over years, eg. Combination of one or more: Georgian, Edwardian and Victorian, the style that best promotes the area, ie. One that has the majority era structures left or capacity size requirements as examples should be utilised by house builders, especially where a streetscape may have been annihilated during the World Wars.									

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 und?	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
								years’ experience who has championed and led a number of successful campaigns to promote TVA in modern-day life. His dual mandate is to provide effective (alternative) use of historical buildings encompassing a full restoration alongside achieving the mainstream construction of new classical architecture on numerous economic, environmental and ecological grounds that align with existing policy set out by Central Government covering the UK and increasingly elsewhere across the world. Having worked with a wide array of residents, businesses and organisations in that time, which has included the full restoration of the Victorian Verandahs on Lord Street, Southport in tandem with the respective key stakeholders and other property owners to prevent demolition of Old Builds across Sefton, Mr. Barton is now hoping to make the process of utilising the built environment to its fullest potential a far simpler one that will enable Bootle to fully reach its maximum potential as a historic town. Page 6 of 18 Mr. Barton should like to credit and thank the leading											

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 und?	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. Why?	Sup porti ng Evid enc e sup plie d?	Opt ion A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Require d		
								professionals and organisations that continue to support his TVA endeavours including: 1) Mr. Francis Shaw- Shaw & Jagger Architects 2) The King’s Foundation 3) Create Streets 4) Francis Terry & Associates 5) The Institute for Traditional Architecture This Submission is supported by the following appendices: i) Appendix i): Academic Perspective on Traditional Architecture by Mr. Francis Shaw of Shaw & Jagger Architects (PDF) ii) Appendix ii.) Written Endorsement from Mr. Joseph Jutras of The Institute of Traditional Architecture (PDF) 1. Appendix 1: Sefton Climate Emergency Strategy Climate Emergency Strategy 2. Appendix 2: Sefton 2023/2024 Climate Report modgov.sefton.gov.uk/doc uments/s124335/Climate+ Emergency+Annual+Report +2023-2024+final.pdf 3. Francis Terry & Associates- The Secrets of Popular Architecture https://www.ftanda.co.uk/t houghts/secret-of-popular- architecture/ 4. Appendix 3: PAS Guide to better Sustainability Appraisal PAS Guide to													

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required			
								better Sustainability Appraisal   Local Government Association 5. Appendix 4: Sefton Council Annual Air Quality Report 2024 air-quality-status-report-2024.pdf 6. Francis Terry & Associates- Natural Architecture Discussion <a href="https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/natural-architecture/">https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/natural-architecture/</a> 7. Francis Terry & Associates- Sustainable Architecture Discussion (VIDEO) <a href="https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/what-is-sustainable-architecture/">https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/what-is-sustainable-architecture/</a> 8. Francis Terry & Associates- Can Beautiful Homes be built in a Factory? <a href="https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/beautiful-homes/">https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/beautiful-homes/</a> 9. Create Streets- Design Codes Explanation design codes 10. Create Streets- Bootle Christ Church Project Bootle with Safe Regen 11. The King’s Foundation- Officer’s Mess Design Guide Rutland (PDF) 12. Create Streets- Lichfield Design Guide- Lichfield 13. Create Streets- Chatham Design Guide- Chatham Page 7 of 18 14. Create Streets- Street Assessment Service Street Assessment - Create														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								Streets 15. Create Communities Mapping Platform Create Communities mapping platform - Create Streets 16. The King’s Foundation-BIMBY Toolkit Puts the power in your hands to influence new buildings in your area. 17. Francis Terry & Associates- Poundbury Discussion <a href="https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/poundbury/">https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/poundbury/</a> 18. Institute of Traditional Architecture- Urban Planning Urban Planning – Institute of Traditional Architecture 19. Heritage and the Economy   Historic England 20. The Economic Value of the Heritage Sector   Heritage Counts   Historic England; 21. Investing in Heritage to Avoid Embodied Carbon Emissions   Heritage Counts 22. Historic England; 23. The Embodied Carbon Emissions of Construction and Retrofit Materials for Traditional Buildings   Historic England 24. InYourArea- Community Campaigner David Barton- Placemaking Principles 2021 'Placemaking' is key to the future for Southport claims campaigner											

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 und?	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			
								25. InYourArea- Community Campaigner David Barton- Role of Traditional Town 2021 The role of the traditional town 'key' to Southport's future 26. Living with Beauty Report Example 76, Page. 177 Living with beauty: report of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission 27. InYourArea- Community Campaigner David Barton- Green Action Plan 2021 Former Councillor proposes climate change plan 28. InYourArea- Community Campaigner David Barton- Hedgerow Planting Benefits 2021 Campaigner calls for more green spaces in Southport 29. Benefits of Greenery Planting- The Guardian 2010 <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/environment/green-living-blog/2010/oct/14/carbon-footprint-house">https://www.theguardian.com/environment/green-living-blog/2010/oct/14/carbon-footprint-house</a> 30. Francis Terry & Associates- Glad to be Pastiche Discussion <a href="https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/glad-to-be-pastiche/">https://www.ftanda.co.uk/thoughts/glad-to-be-pastiche/</a> 31. Francis Terry & Associates- What is more important, Materials or Form? <a href="https://www.ftanda.co.uk/t">https://www.ftanda.co.uk/t</a>														

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
								houghts/rotonda-in-cheese/ 32. InYourArea- Community Campaigner David Barton-Lathom Hall Seaforth <a href="https://www.inyourarea.co.uk/news/restoration-of-seaforth-beatles-landmark-club-a-breakthrough-in-combatting-climate-crisis">https://www.inyourarea.co.uk/news/restoration-of-seaforth-beatles-landmark-club-a-breakthrough-in-combatting-climate-crisis</a>											

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
1448-0002	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular Architecture	Not Stated	D9	Not Stated		Not Stated		SECTION 2: Designated & Non-Designated Heritage Assets: 1. Enhancement of Historic Areas to remove modern street furniture with the integration of classical style timepieces should be encouraged and pursued wherever possible with clear preferred guides set out for each part of the City. 2. Enhancement of Setting with funding grants and financial incentives from all tiers of Government for Private Investors especially those contributing actively towards achieving Net Zero through Embodied Energy/ Carbon Capacity rich measures, i.e. Retention of Old Builds. 3. Archive Pooling of invaluable source material, such as Historic Photographs, Oil Paintings, such as “Memory Lane” featured on InYourArea Magazine to enrich existing material archives. 4. New officialising of Non-Designated Heritage Assets must be actively supported even if informed by the (wider) community thereby providing some possibility of removing these from risk of demolition. 5. Incentives must be provided to those dependable sincere third party investors that take on, maintain and protect said		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Advocates removal of modern street furniture, provision of grants and incentives for investors retaining old builds, pooling archives, and supporting community recognition of non-designated assets. Recommends incentives for third-party investors, remote engagement with property owners, defining character areas using authentic blueprints, conserving industry at historic complexes, and outreach to owners demolishing worship or landmark buildings. Suggests mandatory collaboration through community champions, reconstruction programmes, expanded risk checklists, and tailored funding packages. For conservation areas, calls for simplified listed building	Noted	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 und?	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
											sites against their annihilation from the streetscape with rescue-packages actively promoted and supported once again with a trusted Directory creating goodwill amongst the local community. 6. Opportunity to meet or correspond on Zoom Conference Call regarding key areas, buildings and places at risk where key stakeholders, such as property owners may be better placed to engage in positive and constructive discussion through third parties, such as myself and a trusted panel of experts in their fields and sectors who could enable these people and organisations to maximise their civic heritage, whilst proactively striving to protect more historic buildings from decline and/ or demolition where a strategy package for raising the revenue to do this could be arranged and facilitated. 7. Defining Character Areas- zoning symmetrical parallel construction recommended where distinctive individualised properties remain as checked against authentic archive blueprints. This will ensure high-quality housing for everyone reducing the						consent, enhanced historic appeal, incentives for lost decorative features, support for replica durable materials, prevention of misuse of modern designs, directories of TVA architects, establishment of new conservation areas, support for Blue Plaques, discretionary rate relief, and retention or reproduction of historic street furniture. On historic buildings, proposes creation of designated/non-de signated lists, clearance of vegetation along railways, grant funding for exception areas, guidance on street furniture, rebuilding long-lost buildings on vacant sites, provision of archive blueprints, discretionary tax reductions, authentic suburban styles as compromise, reinstatement of fascia details, collaboration with		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											societal divides between misperceived “good areas” where affluent people reside in historical style properties and less advantaged reside in contemporary ones. 8. Industry should be conserved at former industrial complexes, such as Economic Docks with equivalent sites offering modern-day uses, alongside traditional uses such as export and import of raw materials at places such as Docks and Port encompassing: ICT sector, Green Research & Development, etc. 9. Every effort must be made to reach out to Property Owners, especially Housebuilders that are pursuing demolition of long-beloved buildings, especially those with demonstrable evidence of Holy Worship. 10. Every effort must be made to reach out to Property Owners, especially Housebuilders that are pursuing demolition of landmark buildings, especially those with key links to an area’s founding or history locally. 11. All Powers to monitor, collaborate with existing and/ or new property owners to conserve these buildings should become mandatory with appointed						foundries, banning carbuncle extensions, and financial support for traditional vernacular restoration. For vernacular architecture, urges directories of trusted contractors, encouragement of TVA solid wall construction, simplified consent forms, heritage skills programmes, in-keeping extensions, adoption of historic layouts for new estates, timeless designs for housing expansion, infrastructure planning to avoid congestion, reinstatement of historic layouts, prevention of modern structures dividing communities, and protection of façades.			

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											Community Champions for Civic Heritage that area direct link between Local Authorities and said wider key stakeholders to prevent demolition of structures that may be at risk of destruction from vandalism, urban exploration and demolition. 12. Reconstruction Programme harnessing existing limited crafts people’s skillsets to be used as a fundraising vehicle to bring back buildings that may have been demolished to dissuade future demolition as a choice by property owners and by means of expanding these otherwise lost skillsets that are at live risk of becoming extinct from the UK. 13. Checklist of buildings at high risk must be expanded beyond the existing groups and organisations that are saturated with high caseloads, such as SAVE Britain’s Heritage, etc so that dialogue channels can be created and fostered between Community Champions for Civic Heritage. 14. Bespoke-tailored funding packages for Properties at Risk of decline or demolition should be integrated with Local, Regional and Central Government-funding as a								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	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 of regional economic output through the return on investment that may support other key grant funding capital infrastructure projects, such as transportation and drainage improvements. SECTION 3: Conservation Areas:- 1. Alterations for Listed Building Consent must be simplified with additional streamlined testing methodologies, such as proof of legitimate third party support, such as correspondence chains between applicant and Groups, such as The Victorian Society that can assist LAs complete workload much sooner allowing more attention for challenging cases, such as Non-Designated Heritage Assets at live or upcoming risk of demolition by Housebuilders, etc. 2. Highways & Street Furniture should be duly supported across the whole of an area to enhance its historic appeal to the commercial community as much to its indigenous community; as this is supported greatly in equivalent Public Realm Strategy SPDs- where any and all guidance and support must and should be provided, with key at risk projects being an									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											exceptional anecdote that may be cited in future documents or versions of this and other consultations to stimulate economic construction and restoration across other designated Conservation Areas, etc or otherwise. 3. Provide incentives for the return of lost adornments and decorative features, such as roof fixtures like Chimney Stacks once again with an approved contractor directory to make Old Builds practical to own, live and work in the 2020s onwards. If a Directory cannot be provided then specific wording and guides on esoteric restoration and new traditional building styles that would see modern-day use of decorative features must be provided by the Local Council. 4. Permissions for authentic replica and more durable materials, such as reproduction sash windows must be supported to prevent exorbitant high costs through procuring these, limited longevity and economic climates being unstable. This must be assessed on a case by case basis. 5. No more deliberate manipulation and selective misinterpretation of using								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											contemporary modern designs using old-style fabric raw materials, such as stone cladding for new housing where the design and shape clearly undermine the concept of blending within or around a Conservation Area. 6. Compendium of approved and recognised TVA Architects based across the UK with a view to supporting the training in time of more Northern counterparts to reduce cost associated with travel expenses, etc. This will actively reduce the level of demolition applications countering the purpose of this SPD and other live Policy. If a Directory cannot be provided then specific wording and guides on esoteric restoration and new traditional building styles that would see modern-day use of decorative features must be provided by the Local Council. 7. New Conservation Areas should be established covering areas of surviving built historic environment to positively reverse fascia changes to more modern ones. 8. Blue Plaques should be fully supported across as many different Conurbations, especially if Applicants reach out for								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											endorsements. Page 12 of 18 9. Discretionary Rate Relief should be provided to those proactively support LAs with conserving their respective Conservation Areas through their own resources, skillsets and time as an incentive to others to work alongside the Council positively and constructively. 10. Where long-lost prized buildings are reconstructed whether based in a Conservation Area or not this should confer discretionary financial support, e.g. Rate Relief for the length of time taken to produce this outcome acknowledging the embodied carbon now contributing positively towards the LA’s Climate Change Action Plan Targets. 11. Retention of historic street furniture, such as Lamp Posts adorning high streets or Promenade style streetscapes with collaborate fundraising models utilised from key stakeholders, such as property owners, undisclosed third party investors, Residents’ Groups, etc. 12. Retention of historic street furniture, such as Lamp Posts adorning high streets or Promenade style streetscapes with authentic								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											identical reproductions permitted where all options to secure finance have been fully exhausted and/or the existing streetscape is at imminent risk of receiving contemporary replacement street furniture on health and safety grounds, eg. Lap Posts. SECTION 5: Historic Buildings:- 1. Create a Designated AND a Non-Designated Heritage Asset List, such as AHV whereby existing buildings and those that may yet return can be logged and recorded to combat the Climate Crisis whilst making heritage work for LAs in modern day with attractive locations timeless for everyone to appreciate enhancing the investor appeal, all-round interest and acknowledging the industrial pioneering legacy of the City. 2. Clearance of vegetation along the Railway Lines alongside other equivalent parts of the Line to eradicate the perceived neglected aesthetic. 3. Exception Areas, such as those at risk or recently restored have the real potential for wider grant funding for ambitious projects out of the realm necessarily of undisclosed third party investors supporting Property								



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											Owners, therefore all and any support in reaching these person(s) will greatly contribute to all possible tangible success in the interim period. 4. Providing key guidance, such as agreed in-keeping historic street furniture, such as Cast Iron Lamp Posts, Bins, Planters approved upon inspection of historic photographs, agreed installation and where appropriate maintenance by the LA will ensure the iterative success of this transferring to other Conservation Areas, etc. 5. Scheme to rebuild and reconstruct long-lost buildings, prioritising vacant sites that could adapt some mixed use with residential accommodation and commercial application thereby supporting Climate Action, creating employment and recordable success through placing of necessary economic drivers, such as offices for Technology Sector if original use cannot be sourced in sufficient time simultaneously meeting housing targets. 6. Archive Blueprints for historic conurbations that have suffered architecturally over time through building conversions, demolitions, etc should be provided to									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											key stakeholders, if necessary with a printing charge available for official spiral hard copy version to view detailed historic plans covering layouts, etc. 7. Those people and organisations that have either/ both maintained their properties well over the years or may wish to provide additional support to others, such as restorative support, archive blueprint guidance, etc should be eligible for discretionary reductions by the Council across various property taxes where they may be suffering hardship or through personal circumstances. 8. “Newer” style housing with true authentic rhythm, such as Suburban style faux Tudor fascia frontages with red clay tile pitched roofs and terracotta design windows (tile hung walls) are a good compromise whereupon finance and scheduling may otherwise adversely impact on housing settlements. 9. Fascia Frontage details should be reinstated whether in a Conservation Area or not, especially where approval has been granted to rebuild an entire house using breeze block to produce a stereotypical black, white and grey dwelling out of place.								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											<p>Page 15 of 18</p> <p>10. LAs should work closely with Foundries to procure raw materials and building services in the event of harnessing their own Contractor Firm(s) in-house that could work cross-authority to make net savings whilst ensuring particular new housing neighbourhoods conform to an appropriate style.</p> <p>11. Modern “Carbuncle” extensions should not be permitted at any one area- instead an authentic style addition may be used to retain blending.</p> <p>12. Discretionary financial support packages to assist House Builders choosing the traditional vernacular route should be considered and utilised where it can be proven that this third party will restore the historic streetscape yet making it applicable or modern day requirements- residential or commercial. This may be especially so where they are able to help others prevent the demolition of a prized Old Build built before the 1950s.</p> <p>SECTION 6: Traditional Vernacular Architecture:-</p> <p>1. Provide a directory of approved and trusted Conservation Specialist Contractors- this will be key for repairs and maintenance reducing</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
											costs for all parties, expediting the physical process of regeneration and smoothen planning work schedules so that finer detail may be considered on priority cases or those that may be at risk of consequential repair, such as Places of Worship and detached Buildings with flat roofs, etc at higher risk of damage than customary dwellings. 2. These same people should be readily contactable for new construction 3. Encourage smart building methods and use of TVA as meticulously explained in this SPD outlining “Breathing” Solid Wall Construction using older style materials thereby reducing maintenance cost which combined with the approved contractor directory will further drive down costs, time and effort for everyone. 4. Alterations- must introduce a simplified listed building consent form and application process that is streamlined encouraging better maintenance of Old Builds and reducing the rising propensity of builders to allow buildings to deteriorate, such as the Historic Pub that had to be rebuilt in Kilburn, London post 2015.								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required	
											5. Provide specialist Heritage Arts & Craft Skills Programmes that anyone can learn and use so that these high cost tasks can eventually stabilise in price making them more affordable and available to those that don't have the time to do this themselves or may be risk averse even. 6. Extensions- there must be a proactive emphasis on in-keeping structural fabric to prevent future errors, such as the Municipal Building depicted in the SPD being replicated again thereby harming the Conservation value. 7. New Housing Estates should adopt historical archival blueprints, ie. A Georgian, Victorian or Edwardian layout with the likeliest period architecture utilised where this area remained greenbelt until the 1950s. Page 16 of 18 8. Area Expansion of housing must revert to traditional timeless designs that confer many practical advantages over modern styles that are harder to maintain are timeless with regard to dating and ensure a more evenly distributed community atmosphere in the long-term future. 9. Infrastructure should be appropriately considered for existing and new areas									

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											so that no one area is at risk of becoming congested through traffic for a particular commodity, such as Schools, Doctor Practice, Dental Practice, etc. 10. Site Layouts should complement the historic layout with a view to Post 1950s contemporary Architecture out of place being one day demolished to reinstate Long-lost beloved buildings from before the World Wars that could blossom economically today. 11. Building Form shouldn't permit for dated modern structures that delineate and essentially divide communities between the old and new parts of any one location. 12. Façade Design mustn't be compromised for contemporary architecture, especially in view of coveted Heritage Status for any one area being at risk of being lost if said contemporary architecture is pursued.								
1448-0003	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular Architecture	Not Stated	SD1	Not Stated		Not Stated		Flooding Defences- existing and prospective hotspot areas should be clearly identified for emergency grant funding whereby Local Authorities, especially across a region may agree with the respective Government Department to distribute		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Flooding hotspots should be identified for emergency grant funding, with regional cooperation to prevent recurrent repairs.	Noted	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
											emergency flooding to prevent costly consequential recurrent repairs.								
1448-0004	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular Architecture	Not Stated	ENV3					Biodiversity- maximise greenery along all arterial roads and commuter routes with dense tree planting and the introduction of hedgerows and wherever possible financial incentives to get more private property owners on side.		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Greenery should be maximised along arterial and commuter routes with tree planting and hedgerows, incentivising private owners.	Noted	N
1448-0005	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular Architecture	Not Stated	SD5	Not Stated		Not Stated		Pleased to note that LAS broadly acknowledge and grasp this concept therefore the aim should be to increase the net number of carbon-rich Old Builds long-term through support packages that will combat the Climate Crisis, provide economic benefit and improve Conservation in a pioneering fashion that may draw wider funding opportunities for the area. 2. Retrofit Ventilation is a key point that should warrant future new construction utilising higher ceilings through the reconstruction of Old Builds outfitted for the modern day with retrofitted energy supplies, etc that will also serve to break down societal divides regarding perceived good and bad areas where streetscapes are harmonious yet distinctly unique in beauty like any one Conservation		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Calls for increasing carbon-rich old builds through support packages to combat climate change and improve conservation. Recommends retrofit ventilation in reconstructed old builds, prioritisation of embodied energy and carbon, brick-by-brick case studies inviting academic institutions, provision of sustainable materials directories or guides, and financial incentives to demolish carbon-poor towers to restore skylines.	Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											Area. 3. Embodied energy and embodied carbon- must remain a central priority and so influence new construction to readopt TVA principles as this will be pivotal towards the area’s future green credentials as outlined in many existing auxiliary planning documents approved presently with Carbon Studies taken of existing architecture, notably buildings saved from demolition. 4. A brick by brick case study of as many buildings as possible may warrant invitation of national and international academic institutions to undertake a regional or national Carbon Study further justifying the retention of prized Old Builds elsewhere across the area, region and the UK. 5. Sustainable Materials- an approved contractor directory that could readily advise and source the necessary raw materials with realistically reduced costs substantially Page 13 of 18 again deterring potential demolition-driven applicants from consuming workload time of the Planning Department. If a Directory cannot be provided then specific wording and guides on								



ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											esoteric restoration and new traditional building styles that would see modern-day use of sustainable materials must be provided by the Local Council. Financial Incentives for the demolition of Carbon-poor Glass Towers and contemporary construction should be utilised to restore the skylines across any one area whilst providing better mathematical application of the space for residential and commercial use, such as larger tenement buildings or the original streetscape reinstated yet designated specifically for housing where there may be a deficit.								
1448-0006	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular Architecture	Not Stated	T1	Not Stated		Not Stated		Transportation using arterial roads and commuter routes (Motorways and Railways) should prioritise linking each end of a Local Government sphere with the surrounding Local Government spheres, such as Southport at the very northern tip of Merseyside where transportation links are much weaker with Lancashire in the north and east than with the rest of Merseyside to the south.		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Transport links should prioritise connecting Local Government spheres, especially weak connections like Southport with Lancashire.	Noted	N
1448-0007	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular	Not Stated	ENV 2	Not Stated		Not Stated		Coastlines should be reclassified as SSSIs, especially where the economic potential is not being fully realised, such as		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Coastlines should be reclassified as SSSIs, especially underused beaches like	Noted	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
				ar Architecture							Coastal Towns with underused Beaches, such as Southport in Sefton as one example for other LAs.						Southport in Sefton.		
1448-0008	Organisation	David	Barton	Traditional Vernacular Architecture	Not Stated	Whole Plan	Not Stated		Not Stated		SECTION 7: Making an application:- 1. Identify recurring applicants that are harming civic heritage, be this across Conservation Areas, Non-designated heritage assets or elsewhere with experience of demolition to date- this should be considered before granting permission to apply or acquire planning approval. 2. Enforcement Penalties for key stakeholders that purposely allow their properties to fall into decline and hoped eventual demolition through this tactic, which is more prevalent since 2020. 3. Create an Action Plan to deter persons or organisations from pursuing demolition, such as financial incentives, sincere investor network directory set by Central Government to offload for profit and enforced Design Codes that cannot be manipulated through semantics like Design Guides in isolation as has happened elsewhere. This must be kept for emergency instances where there is an expected threat of decline or demolition. 4. Agreed that temporary		Not Stated	Not Stated	Not Stated		Recommends identifying recurring demolition applicants, imposing penalties for decline tactics, creating deterrent action plans, permitting temporary accessibility alterations, publicising pre-consultation, undertaking brick-by-brick analysis, locking feedback unless re-invited, forming partnerships with property owners of at-risk buildings, preventing urban explorers, and working closely with community champions and heritage groups. Miscellaneous points include supporting reconstruction of old builds (European/US examples), adopting unadopted roads, pre-approving conservation-style	Noted	N

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											alteration of heritage sites, such as stairs or ramps for wheelchairs should be utilised to prevent deleterious loss of historic surroundings and features alike. 5. Full Pre-Consultation publicised and utilised to ensure appropriate Design Codes for new housing alongside positioning and layout in case volunteer assemblies may assist property owners with restoration of historic buildings. 6. Brick by brick Analysis undertaken of projects set for Traditional reconstruction so that these statistics may provide both the Council with evidence for green grant funding support for other key infrastructure projects, such as Transportation and Page 17 of 18 Drainage Defences and property owners may incur a discretionary reduction in associated reconstruction costs of heritage buildings and vistas. 7. Ability to lock feedback in for Consultation automatically unless the council can alert interested consultees in taking part again whether they are locally, regionally or nationally based. 8. Special partnerships with Property Owners of historic						street furniture, providing archive access and waivers, supporting car parking freedom, designing parking abodes in keeping with heritage, publishing names of willing consultees, offering tours of traditional architecture, using meritocratic skillsets for emergency projects, creating top ten registers of buildings at risk, assessing infrastructure impacts such as air quality, and monitoring free car parking through proof of purchase.		

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											buildings at risk of decline/ demolition to discreetly support them with the option to publicise this accordingly to reach out to others in the same position to secure alternative use for these structures as opposed to demolition. 9. Proactive effort to stop Breaking and Entering style of “Urban Explorers” who are coincidentally apparent whenever demolition is scheduled for buildings especially since 2020. 10. LAs to proactively work closely alongside Community Champions and other leading Heritage Groups, such as English Heritage giving these organisations a voice on the frontlines, especially where so many buildings are presently being overlooked for additional guidance and/ or support due to cost and time restraints facing these same groups and organisations (including the LA). SECTION 8: MISCELLANEOUS:- 1. Provide all possible support for the reconstruction of Old Builds as is happening elsewhere across Europe, especially Budapest, Hungary, North America, etc to significantly increase Embodied Energy/ Carbon storage. 2. Establish a Plan to adopt								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											Unadopted Roads or supply key services, such as carriageway resurfacing as disabled access and entry/ exit of Emergency Vehicles is presently a cause for concern. 3. Provide Pre-Approval and agreement of specialist Conservation Area style Historic Street Furniture, such as Cast Iron Lamp Posts, Bins and Planters for this prime Conservation Area including installation, maintenance costs (where appropriate). 4. Provide full access to the Archive Resources (at no/minimal cost) as an invaluable incentive for existing and parallel undisclosed third Party Investors. Discretionary waivers may be appropriate for those third parties proactively working to prevent decline and demolition of historic buildings. 5. Car Parking on and off street should be supported to ensure freedom of choice for everyone, accessibility and connectedness. 6. Car Parking abodes should be tastefully designed like modern-day stables for vehicles that are in-keeping with the built historic environment. 7. Provide publicly published names of consultees willing to work								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Agent?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/Para No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											alongside the Local authority and other key stakeholders, such as property owners and undisclosed third party investors, etc. 8. Provide select tours for prospective investors and housebuilders of existing traditional architecture where Design Codes of this identical style would complement both old and new architecture bending the area better more cohesively, eg. the form and layout of Oxford City Centre which has changed minimally structurally since the 1800s. 9. Provide a focused effort on utilising people’s skillsets on a meritocratic basis, ie. Procure specialists and volunteers that could work together on key emergency projects, such as Historic buildings at risk without layered bureaucracy on achieving positive outcomes, such as Community Assets where deadlines can be thwarted by separate third parties. 10. Create a Top Ten Historic Buildings at Risk Register where appropriate conditions, such as security against Urban Exploration, etc can be utilised safeguarding these structures, providing the respective property owners peace of mind whilst actual								

ID Ref	Individual/Organisation/Age nt?	First Name	Last Name	If organisation - name	Has agreed to publication of Name /Comments?	Policy/ Paragraph No.	2a. Legally Compliant?	2b. If No, explanation	3a. Sound?	3b. Positive/Effective/Justified/Consistent?	3c. Explanation	4. Suggested modifications	5. Wish to participate in exam	6. Why?	Supporting Evidence supplied?	Option A, B or C	Summary	Officer Response	Mods Required
											scope for revitalising these for solid economic gain. 11. Infrastructure assessments should be fully outlined, such as Air Quality risk from new construction at presently congested areas, hence the case for Traditional Architecture that will confer longevity benefits in the long-term with as much free car parking as possible. 12. Free Car Parking may be monitored through expected proof of purchase when visiting, eg. minimal £1.00 at a shop encouraging partnerships between private businesses and LAs.								
Intentionally Left Blank																			