

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

Tuesday 29 June 2021

0930 start

Matter 5: Housing Allocations

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

Thundersley area. Policies HO18, HO20, HO21, HO22

Local Policy HO18 Land north of Grassmere Road and Borrowdale Road, Thundersley

- Q.143 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 30 new homes'?
- Q.144 Would the Policy be effective in minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity consistent with paragraph 170 of the Framework?
- Q.145 Would the Policy be effective in achieving safe and suitable access for all users consistent with paragraph 108 of the Framework?
- Q.146 The boundary of the proposed allocation site as shown on the Policies Map and that of the Green Belt appear to differ from that considered in the Castle Point Borough Green Belt Review - Part 2 update 2019 (GB-004). Has a specific Green Belt assessment been undertaken for the proposed allocation site?
- Q.147 Is the Policy clear in regards to the provision of off-site sustainable drainage measures in the context of paragraph 165 of the Framework?
- Q.148 What are the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site from the Green Belt?

Q.149 Is the proposed Green Belt boundary justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 139 of the Framework?

Q.150 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?

Q.151 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy HO20 The Chase, Thundersley

Q.159 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 340 new homes'?

Q.160 Does the Policy set a clear design vision and expectations for the proposed site as per paragraph 125 of the Framework and would it be effective?

Q.161 Would the Policy be effective in minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity consistent with paragraph 170 of the Framework?

Q.162 In the absence of the Policy clearly defining the scale of health care facilities and educational requirements, would it be effective in securing necessary provision?

Q.163 Is the Policy consistent with national policy in respect of open space and recreation as set out in paragraphs 96 – 97 of the Framework and is it justified?

Q.164 What are the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site and neighbouring land from the Green Belt?

Q.165 Is the proposed Green Belt boundary justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 139 of the Framework?

Q.166 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?

Q.167 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy HO21 Land fronting Rayleigh Road, Thundersley

Q.168 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 60 new homes'?

Q.169 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?

Q.170 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy HO22 Land at Thames Loose Leaf, Kiln Road, Thundersley

Q.171 What is the justification for the site capacity being 'up to 12 new homes'?

Q.172 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per Framework definitions?

Q.173 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Agenda

Tuesday 29 June 2021

1.30 pm start

Matter 6: Economic Strategy and Policies

Issue: Is the strategy and provision for employment development effective and justified?

Strategic Policy EC1 Economic Strategy

Q.243 On 1 September 2020 the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020 came into force, amending the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. As a consequence, is the Policy clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Q.244 What is the justification for the protection of the identified employment land (Criterion 1a) as shown on the Policies Map and is this consistent with part 11 of the Framework, Making Effective Use of Land?

Q.245 Is the proposed provision of land for new employment development above the baseline employment land requirement identified in the South Essex Economic Development Needs Assessment 2017 (ER-002) justified?

Q.246 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy EC2 New Employment Land

Q.247 With regard to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020, is the Policy clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Q.248 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy EC2 Extension to Manor Trading Estate

- Q.249 Is the proposed allocation of employment land justified?
- Q.250 Is part 1.b. of the Policy consistent with paragraph 174 of the Framework in respect of biodiversity net gain?
- Q.251 What are the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site from the Green Belt?
- Q.252 Is the proposed Green Belt boundary justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 139 of the Framework?
- Q.253 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy EC2 Extension to Charfleets Industrial Estate

- Q.254 What is the planning status of the site, to what extent has the site been delivered and is part 2 of the Policy clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Local Policy EC2 South of Northwick Road

- Q.255 What is the planning status of the site, to what extent has the site been delivered and is part 3 of the Policy clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Local Policy EC3 Canvey Seafront Entertainment Area

- Q.256 With regard to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020, is the Policy clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?
- Q.257 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.258 Is the retail floorspace threshold justified?
- Q.259 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Local Policy EC4 Canvey Port Facilities

- Q.260 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.261 Would the Policy be effective in ensuring that the development would be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere?
- Q.262 Given the hazardous substances handled at the port facilities, would the Policy be effective in ensuring public safety through the prevention of major accidents and limiting their consequences, and is it justified? Conversely, would the Plan be effective (such as through Local Policy NE9) in ensuring that the existing businesses at the Port would not have unreasonable restrictions placed upon them as a result of new development proposed?
- Q.263 Given the process for the consenting of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) and the designated National Policy Statements, is the Policy as worded clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

Close of hearings