

Examination of the New Castle Point Local Plan

Inspector: Philip Lewis BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Programme Officer: Andrea Copsey

Examination Office, PO Box 12607, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 9GN

copseyandrea@gmail.com 07842 643988

Agenda

Hearing Day 5. Wednesday 26 May 2021 0930 start

Matter 5: Housing Allocations

Issue: Are the proposed housing allocations justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Canvey Island area. Policies HO23, HO24, HO25, HO26, HO27, HO28, HO29, HO30, HO31

Local Policy HO23 Land east of Canvey Road, Canvey Island

Q.174 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 300 new homes'?

Q.175 Does criterion 2. which appears to phase the proposed development, serve a clear purpose, and is it justified?

Q.176 Given the proximity of designated heritage assets including the Roman Saltern Scheduled Monument and having regard to the findings of the Heritage Impact Assessment, would the Policy be effective in conserving and enhancing the historic environment?

Q.177 With particular regard to the Canvey Wick Site of Special Scientific Interest, would the Policy be effective in protecting and enhancing biodiversity and securing net measurable gains in biodiversity?

Q.178 Would the Policy be effective in ensuring that any development would, in terms of flood risk, be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere?

Q.179 What is the evidence that safe and suitable access can be provided for all users?

- Q.180 Is it justified to restrict occupation of homes on the site until the new access onto Canvey Road has been provided?
- Q.181 What are the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site and neighbouring land from the Green Belt?
- Q.182 Is the proposed Green Belt boundary justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 139 of the Framework?
- Q.183 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?
- Q.184 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy HO24 Land west of Canvey Road, Canvey Island

- Q.185 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 196 new homes'? Is the proposed care home included within the 196 homes?
- Q.186 Does criterion 2. which appears to phase the proposed development serve a clear purpose, and is it justified?
- Q.187 Given the proximity of a designated heritage asset and having regard to the findings of the Heritage Impact Assessment, would the Policy be effective in conserving and enhancing the historic environment?
- Q.188 With particular regard to the Canvey Wick Site of Special Scientific Interest, would the Policy be effective in protecting and enhancing biodiversity and securing net measurable gains in biodiversity?
- Q.189 Would the Policy be effective in ensuring that any development would, in terms of flood risk, be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere?
- Q.190 Would the Policy be effective in ensuring that an appropriate buffer is applied to the Hill Hall Dyke, a designated Main River?
- Q.191 What are the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site and neighbouring land from the Green Belt?
- Q.192 Is the proposed Green Belt boundary justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 139 of the Framework?

Q.193 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?

Q.194 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy HO25 Land at Thorney Bay Caravan Park

Q.195 Given the existing planning status of the site and ongoing redevelopment, does the proposed allocation serve a clear purpose?

Q.196 Are there any matters which would mean that the site allocation as proposed is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?

Q.197 What is the evidence that around 820 park homes would be provided at the site? Is there a reasonable prospect that these would come forward within the plan period?

Q.198 Is the proposed allocation consistent with national policy for planning and flood risk as set out in paragraphs 155 – 161 of the Framework?

Q.199 Would the policy be effective in safeguarding sufficient land alongside existing sea defences in order to accommodate any potential enhancement works to the defences?

Q.200 Would the safeguarding of land for Roscommon Way be effective given the existing planning status of the site? What is the robust evidence for safeguarding land for Roscommon Way?

Q.201 Would the Policy be effective in minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity consistent with paragraph 170 of the Framework?

Q.202 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Q.203 The proposed Main Modifications seek contributions towards affordable housing and health and social care on the net level of housing growth. Are these requirements consistent with the tests for planning obligations set out in paragraph 56 of the Framework and Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010?

Local Policy HO26 Land at the Point, Canvey Island

- Q.204 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 100 new homes'?
- Q.205 Is the proposed allocation consistent with national policy for planning and flood risk as set out in paragraphs 155 – 161 of the Framework, with particular regard to ensuring that development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere?
- Q.206 Would the policy be effective in safeguarding sufficient land alongside existing sea defences in order to accommodate any potential enhancement works to the defences?
- Q.207 With particular regard to nearby Habitats sites and SSSI, would the Policy be effective in protecting and enhancing biodiversity and is it consistent with the findings of the HRA?
- Q.208 Would the Policy be effective in minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity consistent with paragraph 170 of the Framework?
- Q.209 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?
- Q.210 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy HO27 Walsingham House, off Lionel Road, Canvey Island

- Q.211 What is the current planning status of the site?
- Q.212 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 32 new homes'?
- Q.213 Is the proposed allocation consistent with national policy for planning and flood risk as set out in paragraphs 155 – 161 of the Framework, with particular regard to ensuring that development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere?
- Q.214 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?
- Q.215 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy HO28 Land at Admiral Jellicoe, Canvey Island

- Q.216 What is the current planning status of the site?
- Q.217 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 40 new homes'?
- Q.218 Is the proposed allocation consistent with national policy for planning and flood risk as set out in paragraphs 155 – 161 of the Framework, with particular regard to ensuring that development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere?
- Q.219 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?
- Q.220 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy HO29 Land south of Haron Close, Canvey Island

- Q.221 What is the current planning status of the site?
- Q.222 What is the justification for the site capacity?
- Q.223 What is the evidence that safe and suitable access can be provided for all users?
- Q.224 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?
- Q.225 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy HO30 Land at Haystack carpark, Canvey Island

- Q.226 What is the current planning status of the site?
- Q.227 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 14 new homes'?
- Q.228 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?
- Q.229 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy HO31 Land to the east of Kings Park Village, Canvey Island

Q.230 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 50 new homes'?

Q.231 Is the proposed allocation consistent with national policy for planning and flood risk as set out in paragraphs 155 – 161 of the Framework, with particular regard to ensuring that development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere?

Q.232 Would the policy be effective in safeguarding sufficient land alongside existing sea defences in order to accommodate any potential enhancement works?

Q.233 With particular regard to nearby Habitats sites, would the Policy be effective in protecting and enhancing biodiversity and is it consistent with the findings of the HRA?

Q.234 What are the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site from the Green Belt?

Q.235 Is the proposed Green Belt boundary justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 139 of the Framework?

Q.236 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?

Q.237 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Participants:

Canvey Island Independent Party, Cllr M Tucker

Canvey Green Belt Campaign, Mr G Bracci & Mr S Sawkins

Canvey Island Town Council, Cllr D Blackwell

Persimmon, Pegasus, Mrs N Parsons

Historic England – Mr A Marsh