

JSP Representations on SCI

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
<b>Dr John Victory</b>				
001	Who we will consult	Comment	Please ensure that the following Statutory authority is consulted: Essex Local Access Forum via Essex County Council	Comment noted. The Local Access Forum have been added to the database.
<b>London Southend Airport – (Miss Sam Petrie)</b>				
002	Consultation General Principles	Comment	LSA would welcome being consulted as this plan is developed. LSA would also be happy to meet with relevant members of the team, to brief on the regulatory requirements that LSA must conform with and how that may shape the development. LSA is required to comply with the regulations set out under EASA / CAP 168. There are also useful advice notes that can be found on the AOA website <a href="https://www.aoa.org.uk/policy-campaigns/operations-safety/">https://www.aoa.org.uk/policy-campaigns/operations-safety/</a> , which should be factored into any plans.	LSA will be consulted at future stages of Plan preparation.  Discussions regarding the future ambitions of LSA and the regulatory framework would be welcomed.
<b>Mr Bryan Coxhead</b>				
003	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	Regarding infrastructure; if we are successful in placing the required housing on the east side of North Benfleet, which is the neighbourhoods preferred option, then we should enable direct access to the A130 for those new residents by the improvement of the existing filter to the existing fishing lake, so that the new road network of the new housing estate will link to it. I also think that a roundabout on the A127 at Pound Lane would only create more problems for Pound Lane as even more people would use it as a rat run.	Comment noted. The issue raised is primarily a matter for Castle Point Local Plan rather than the Statement of Community Involvement.
<b>Port of London Authority – (Mrs Helena Payne)</b>				
004	Data Protection Statement	Comment	Noted	Noted
005	When we will Consult	Comment	Targeted engagement with the PLA is encouraged on matters relating to the River, it's tributaries, riverside development (including housing), use of the river, transport and biodiversity, air quality and industry matters.	Comment welcomed. The ASELA authorities would welcome dialogue with Port of London Authority.

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
006	Who we will Consult	Comment	Summary: There is no objection to this element of the SCI introductory section	Comment welcomed
007	Important Note	Comment	Noted and accepted	Noted
008	Background	Comment	The PLA request to be involved in the consultation of the South Essex Plan	PLA will be an important consultee as part of Duty to Co-operate requirements
009	Consultation General Principles	Comment	The PLA requests to be consulted at each stage of the development plan process and would encourage early engagement on matters relating to the River Thames, Transport, Industry and biodiversity	Comments noted. PLA will be consulted at each stage of Plan preparation and as part of Duty to Co-operate
010	Who we will Consult	Comment	Noted	Noted
011	How we will consult	Comment	Noted	Noted
<b>Mr Ken Richmond</b>				
012	Who we will consult	Comment	My only comment is the importance of making printed consultation documents available at Libraries and, a suggestion, include Billericay Town Council Office. I'd be happy to pay. Making them available for download is not sufficient as it disenfranchises those without the technology or a printer.	It is recognised that printed materials are important. Reference copies of the SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan were available to view during the consultation period at the main Basildon Council Offices, and at Basildon, Billericay and Wickford Libraries in accordance with the Basildon SCI.
<b>Mr Keith Haynes</b>				
014	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	Bus transport shelters need updating in order for those buses fitted with location technology can be registered and advice on time of arrival be indicated to waiting customers.	Comment noted. This is a Highway Authority issue rather than a matter for the SCI
<b>Mr Malcolm Straiton</b>				
015	Who we will consult	Comment	Do NOT under any circumstances get involved with this, it is a waste of money. If you do get involved the funds are to come from those already	Comment noted.

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			allocated to planning. Reason:- The Government has recently proved beyond doubt that it is incapable of decision.	
<b>Maldon District Council (Ms Leonie Alpin)</b>				
<b>016</b>	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	Maldon District Council has no comments to make on the SE Plan SCI.	Comment noted
<b>Mr Colin Holbrook</b>				
<b>017</b>	Who we will consult	Comment	<p>My concern is that the South Essex plan only sets out to consult with the internal authorities who make up the South Essex area. There is no requirement to liaise or consult with the individual Authorities or even the larger Group Authorities (e.g. Greater London; West Essex &amp; East Hertfordshire; Chelmsford; Epping Forest; Harlow, etc).</p> <p>This lack of consultation has caused significant issues in the Brentwood Local Development Plan where the lack of specific planning consultations between bordering authorities has led to large developments being approved by one Council (with no impact on the approving councils resources) imposing a major burden on the neighbouring Councils infrastructure. The neighbouring Council has no say or input to the viability of the proposed development right on their border. One current example of this is a large development approved by Epping Forest Council right on the boundary with Brentwood which impacts directly the infrastructure of Blackmore. The new housing is less than a mile from the village but the Brentwood Council have no input and receive no funding to bolster the infrastructure of the village which will be irreparably damaged by the burden imposed.</p> <p>I believe that it is imperative that all Local Plans and Statements of Community Involvement should include requirements for cross boundary consultation and not ignore the authorities and people who live the other side on the line.</p>	<p>All local authorities have a statutory obligation to consult with neighbouring authorities and undertake meetings. This is known as the "Duty to co-operate".</p> <p>Neighbouring authorities surrounding Brentwood, such as London Borough of Havering, Epping Forest District Council, and Chelmsford City Council, were all notified of the Addendum Statement of Community Involvement consultation. The South Essex Authorities are currently developing a comprehensive engagement strategy / duty to co-operate plan to ensure all relevant bodies and individuals are consulted with through the development of the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan.</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
<b>Ms Helen Wright</b>				
018	Introduction	Comment	I wish to be involved in the public consultation surrounding the South Essex Plan. I am particularly concerned about the over development of (what is supposed to be our rural area, given that our existing roads are already highly congested. I also have grave concerns about the environmental implications and the flood risk in our zone 3 (high probability) area.	Comments noted. Your details have been added to the South Essex Plan database.
<b>Miss Lisa MacDonald</b>				
019	How we consult	Comment	I object to any loss of greenbelt. Any building must include infrastructure and must look at the impact on the whole of the south east region of England.	Comments notes. These issues will be considered as part of the development of the South Essex Plan
<b>Transport for London (TfL) – Mr Richard Carr</b>				
020	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	We have no comments to make on the proposed addendum but we look forward to engaging with the South Essex authorities in the development of the Plan as part of the Duty to Cooperate	Comments noted. Engagement with TfL will be an important part of the Plan preparation process.
<b>Dr Abdul Basit</b>				
021	Introduction	Comment	Kindly include in the Essex Plan a provision for making East Tilbury Level railway crossing safer and free from traffic congestion by making the train to pass under the road or the road to pass under the train line.	Comments noted. This is a Highways and Local Plan issue  It is considered that the issues raised in this representation are matters that are more appropriate to be considered through the preparation of the Thurrock Council New Local Plan will be logged and reported accordingly.
<b>Mrs Julie Waldie</b>				

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
022	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	I object to these plans. They do not take into account the number of people, families and cars which will need access to the roads, schools, doctors in the area. The roads will be gridlocked. Accidents will happen. I also object to the use of green land ("protected green land" the only areas we have to breath clean air and where our precious few numbers of wild animals can live safely) being used for this development. This plan seems to be separate from the other plans for Billericay - they should all be considered together surely?	Comments noted.  The issues raised are primarily Basildon Local Plan matters. The South Essex Plan will form an overarching Strategy for the whole South Essex area, setting a context for future Local Plan preparation.
<b>NHS Thurrock CCG (Mrs Louise Banks)</b>				
023	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	Thurrock CCG welcomes a standardised approach across all South Essex Councils for Community Involvement.	Comments welcomed.
024	When we will consult	Comment	We look forward to working with you on future consultations and to collaborating on getting this out to hard to reach groups.	The South Essex authorities would welcome the opportunity to work with the CCG, including looking at ways of reaching "hard to reach" groups
025	Who we will consult	Comment	I assume you will already have thought about Healthwatches in the area and how they can support with getting the consultations out to the hard to reach populations.	It would be helpful to have further discussion on the role of Healthwatches and the opportunities these offer.
<b>Mr Andrew Wilson</b>				
026	Introduction	Comment	Whilst I have no comments to make about the proposed SCI itself, I do have concerns about the total lack of information in the public domain on the activities of ASELA to date. I can find no record of meetings but I know from my local councillors that several meetings have taken place. For ASELA to be credible, and for the SCI to be a relevant undertaking, residents must be comfortable that matters are being conducted openly and transparently. That is not the case today.	Interest in the work of ASELA is welcomed. ASELA is a relatively new organisation governed by a MoU agreed by the 7 local authorities involved. <a href="#">ASELA Memorandum of Understanding</a>  It is recognised that existing structures, procedures and

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
				<p>communication continue to evolve and will need to adapt to a rapidly changing internal and external context. An ASELA Website is being developed to facilitate this:</p> <p><a href="https://www.thurrock.gov.uk/aseლა">https://www.thurrock.gov.uk/aseლა</a></p> <p>Due consideration will be given to future governance models as required. Each sovereign authority uses its own decision making processes when collective decisions are required e.g. adoption of the Statement of Common Ground.</p>
027	Who we will consult	Comment	Residents Associations and Action Groups that are representing the views of residents on matters concerning local plans should be included in this chapter. Specifically for Basildon Borough, the Billericay District Residents' Association and the Billericay Action Group.	<p>Residents Associations and Action Groups are covered within the SCI Addendum under 'groups representing place, communities or other special interests'. Those interested in being involved with the preparation of the South Essex Plan are encouraged to register on the consultation database which can be found on <a href="http://www.southessexplan.co.uk">www.southessexplan.co.uk</a></p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
028	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	Essex County Council is satisfied with the content of the Statement of Community Involvement Addendum and confirms that it wishes to be included on the South Essex Plan consultation database.	Comments noted
<b>Billericay Action Group (Mr Alasdair Daw)</b>				
029	Consultation General Principles	Comment	It's important that the overall strategy with regard do housing numbers is consulted on in an open-minded manner. For instance do we: - Seek to exceed Local Housing Need in order to seek some form of extra central government funding for infrastructure upgrades - Meet Local Housing Need (double 'natural change' requirements in any case - source: Gtr Essex Demog Forecasts, 2017) - Cite Green Belt and Transport constraints as a reason to build fewer homes than suggested by Local Housing Need figures.	Noted. This is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities' approach to community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The South Essex Plan will address the whole range of housing issues
<b>Mr John Longhurst</b>				
030	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	Whilst it is appreciated that areas need to be developed to provide housing and amenities for projected population and economic growth in the South Essex Area, the needs and requirements of existing residents and businesses who are already in situ should always take precedence over speculative projections which ultimately may not in fact be borne out. This should be a long term strategy to meet the needs of primarily the existing and potential future South Essex community not simply an exercise to tick boxes and meet hypothetical targets set but some Government Department think tank.	Comments noted.  This is outside the scope of the SCI. The preparation of the South Essex Plan will need to reflect Government guidance in order to be found sound by an independent Inspector. This will require addressing a range of issues including local needs but also external pressures.
031	Consultation General Principles	Comment	Whilst it is appreciated that areas need to be developed to provide housing and amenities for projected population and economic growth in the South Essex Area, the needs and requirements of existing residents and businesses who are already in situ should always take precedence over speculative projections which ultimately may not in fact be borne out. This should be a long term strategy to meet the needs of primarily the existing and then the potential future South	Comments noted.  This is outside the scope of the SCI. The preparation of the South Essex Plan will need to reflect Government guidance in order to be found sound by an

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			Essex community not simply an exercise to tick boxes and meet hypothetical targets set by some Government Department think tank.	independent Inspector. This will require addressing a range of issues including local needs but also external pressures.
<b>Dunton Community Association (Mr David Llewellyn)</b>				
032	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	Summary: In the second paragraph "Examination into the document" should read "Examination of the document."	Noted and agreed. Document amended accordingly.
033	When we will consult	Comment	Summary: In the first bullet "Each authorities Local Development Scheme" should read "Each authority's Local Development Scheme". In the final bullet "the role that the previous consultation had on" should read "the role that the previous consultation played in".	Noted and agreed. Document amended accordingly.
034	Who we will consult	Comment	Summary: We agree with the third bullet and would like to underline the importance of consulting groups representing place. Some villages, such as Dunton, are represented by a community or residents' association and not by a parish council.	Comment noted.
035	Consultation General Principles	Comment	Summary: Add a further bullet reading "We will approach the consultation process with an open mind and be prepared to alter our position in the light of the information that it discloses". Add a further bullet point reading "Where work is carried out by an individual authority (acting on behalf of all the authorities) we will take great care to avoid the introduction of any bias in favour of the authority carrying out the work".	Comments noted and bullet added.  Comments noted. This observation is primarily focussed on Plan-making rather than the SCI. Amended text will be included to relate this to consultation  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Consultation will be based on publically available evidence base documents and be without factual or geographic bias”</li> </ul>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
036	How will we consult	Comment	Summary: At the end of the fifth bullet add "Such events will be used solely to inform participants and not to influence their attitude towards our proposals".	<p>Consultation and engagement is a two way process. The authorities preparing the Plan need to be open to altering proposals on the basis of information received as a result of public engagement. Equally, the information made available to participants may have an impact on attitudes by providing additional information.</p> <p>To reflect the concern regarding bias an additional bullet will be added to Consultation General Principles which will state:  "Consultation will be based on publically available evidence base documents..." (see Representation 35 above)</p>
<b>Showmans Guild (Mr John Thurston)</b>				
037	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		I am a senior official of the showmen's Guild of Great Britain. I served three years as head of planning for the Guild and I feel since the changes to the Needs Assessment for Gypsies, Travellers and showmen, our members needs are being ignored . There are no showmen's sites in Brentwood or Havering. The site at buckles lane South Ockendon, has been allowed to be developed without planning into a massive caravan site and is a major catastrophe waiting to happen. Showmen are moving out as more and more static caravans are rented out regardless of enforcement orders being served on many of the sites. I would like to know if there are any plans to include showmen's sites in future.	Noted. This is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities' standards for community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The South Essex Plan will be subject to its own consultation processes in

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
				<p>accordance with the relevant regulations.</p> <p>The South Essex authorities have undertaken a further review of Gypsy, Travellers and Showpersons needs as part of the evidence to inform the South Essex Plan.</p> <p>However it is considered that the issues raised in this representation regarding sites for Travelling showpersons in Thurrock is a matter that is more appropriate to be considered through the preparation of the Thurrock Council New Local Plan will be logged and reported accordingly.</p>
<b>Dr Maria Faraone</b>				
038	Who we will consult		Appendix 1 p.19 Groups to consult: Including infrastructure as well as transport groups will be helpful; including employment and livelihoods related groups will also be important to link what happens in each borough with the planning opportunities as they relate; Also including minority group support NGO groups will help with consultation particularly the early stages to encourage involvement with the minority group members directly	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>“including minorities” added to bullet beginning “Groups...”</p> <p>New bullet added “Transport and Infrastructure Providers”</p>
039	How we will consult		A further note, the location and timing of consultation will very much influence who will be able to participate. Choosing locations where people feel comfortable (ie. local schools for instance) and choosing times when people including women or those from minority groups can without too much rescheduling attend will also make a difference to	<p>Comments noted. Additional wording added at the end of 5<sup>th</sup> bullet “at a range of times and locations”</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			ensuring a more diverse engagement (Perhaps providing one hours of child care or at least reassuring that children are welcome)	
<b>Chelmsford City Council (Gemma Nicholson)</b>				
040	Background	Comment	Thank you for consulting Chelmsford City Council (CCC) on the South Essex Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) Addendum. It is noted that this SCI has been prepared as part of the preparation of the South Essex Plan and will be an addendum to the existing SCIs for each authority involved.	Comment noted
041	Consultation General Principles	Comment	The SCI sets out the framework for how consultation on the South Essex Plan will be undertaken. This Council considers that the SCI is clear and focused. The council supports the general consultation principles outlined for the consultation on the South Essex Plan, however the SCI does not specifically identify adjoining bodies as part of the duty to cooperate.	Comments welcomed. "Neighbouring authorities" have been specifically added to the first bullet of "Who we will consult"
042	Data Protection	Comment	The Council has no comments to make to the Data Protection statement. CCC wishes to be included on the database for the South Essex Plan and be notified of future consultations. Chelmsford City Council will continue to actively engage with the local authorities producing the South Essex Plan.	Comments noted. Chelmsford CC have been added to the database and continued engagement is welcomed.
<b>Danny Ryan</b>				
043	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	With reference to the planning in Billericay, named above, as I live in Frithwood Lane!! I am struggling to see how any of these planners cannot see that this Road is far too narrow for two vehicles to pass each other now let alone with at least another 1000 more vehicles planned. It is totally ridiculous to think you are not doing a relief road at the back of the Golf course which was spoken about and would help out the Road connecting to Frithwood Lane. If this plan goes ahead the residents will never get out of their drives let alone onto Tye common Road!! Also how on earth could a bus route go through Frithwood Lane when these houses are built. I'm sure the builders will pay for the buses	Concerns about this specific site are noted and are a Local Plan issue. This is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities' standards for community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The South Essex Plan will be subject to its

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			for the 1st ten years, how good of them bearing in mind how much they will make from building 530 houses!! There really hasn't been any thought given to the Residents, it just seems "that's a big area we will build there." Also there seems to be no infrastructure either, ie School or Doctors. The High Street is overloaded already, plus shops & car parks let alone the Station for people travelling to work. I understand that we need to have new houses in Billericay, but it seems to me the councillors who are making these decisions do not live in the area! As it is at the moment we have too much traffic, when trying to get onto Tye common Road in the rush hour. Note picture attached was taken today (20/1/20 at 8am rush hour and the traffic from the traffic lights is back to Frithwood Lane.. what is it going to be like when they build 530 houses off Frithwood Lane it will be impossible to get into Tye common Road from Frithwood Lane. It will also be chaos using First & Second Avenue trying to get down Wiggins Lane. I hope you can think about this again and into more depth and be reasonable especially to the residents in this area.	own consultation processes in accordance with the relevant regulations.  The Basildon Borough Revised Publication Local Plan Statement of Consultation March 2019 sets out how the Council carried out its consultation process on the Revised Publication Local Plan, and summarises the results of the consultation.
<b>Lawson Planning Partnership (Mrs Sandra Green) on behalf of Industrial Chemicals Ltd (ICL)</b>				
<b>044</b>	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd act for Industrial Chemicals Ltd (ICL) who are major landowners and employers in Thurrock. ICL are actively engaging with Thurrock Council to support the local economy through job generation, and contribute to delivering the homes required to meet local housing needs.  We welcome the opportunity to help inform the draft SCI Addendum and comment therefore, that we endorse the need for a strategic planning framework for the six local authorities to be prepared in liaison with businesses and key stakeholders, such as ICL, as necessary. Please keep LPP on the register to receive all development plan consultations, newsletters and its associated evidence based documents.	Support for a South Essex strategic planning framework and a standardised approach to community involvement is noted.  The respondent will be included on the consultee database for the South Essex Plan and consulted at all public stages of consultation on the plan.
<b>Highways England (Connor Adkins) see Rep no 083</b>				

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
045	Introduction	Comment	Thank you for your consultation dated 16 December 2019. The following local plan is unlikely to have a severe impact on the strategic road network in the East Region. We therefore offer no comment in this case	Comments noted. The South Essex Authorities will continue to engage with Highways England through the plan-making process.
<b>Mr David Newbury</b>				
046	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	Housing is the most important humanistic planning issue and has been for 50 years. Yet, thousands of local, and national politicians have ducked the responsibility of it over the years in order to remain employed, or popular. This was eminently demonstrated by the shenanigans that went on during the middle of this year in Basildon, by shuffling one housing area around for another one that met political, rather than housing purposes. We are not entitled to deny anyone else a safe and weatherproof home in a convenient location. This purpose should be at the heart of all local planning and national planning, and it is being subsumed by less important and some very niche issues that should be subservient to it. Please therefore try to ensure that future infrastructure, communications, transport and energy supply is adequate and appropriate to all reasonably foreseeable eventualities, because, as we have seen over the last few years, even green belt that is not really green belt, is not sacrosanct! If politicians had done their duty over the last 50 years we would have no housing crisis now	Noted. This is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities' standards for community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The South Essex Plan will be subject to its own consultation processes in accordance with the relevant regulations.
<b>Janet Clark</b>				
047	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	This is just a comment and does not require a response. I understand that more housing is required in the Essex area but hope that when planning is considered that changes to the infrastructure required to support the new housing are fully taken into account. For example, expansion of roads, schools and medical facilities. These resources are already strained and additional facilities need to be in place beforehand.	Comments noted. Preparation of the Plan will be informed by a Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
<b>John Surgett</b>				

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
048	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	<p>We do not know how Rochford District Council have the nerve to issue this latest Statement of Community Involvement consultation. We believe that this is no more than just showing compliance to Government Planning Inspectors.</p> <p>Typically, as usual, RDC always launch these consultation related issues to coincide with major holiday periods giving not much time to coordinate District responses.</p> <p>We also believe that all evidence shows that public knowledge is routinely ignored by RDC for example:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The folly of allocating multiple long term and simultaneous developments in the same area (Rawreth &amp; Hullbridge) which was proven in 2019 with widespread traffic gridlock.</li> <li>2. This will no doubt be repeated in 2020 via the same folly in London Road with 3 developments within a 500 metre section of the A129 and coinciding with major works at the Fairglen interchange junction.</li> <li>3. The Planning Inspectors recommendation that the related Watery Lane should be upgraded to "B" status which is currently causing daily traffic problems and has been totally ignored.</li> <li>4. We also know that RDC's Planning Department have received several complaints including the recent refusal for a proposed Retirement Village on the Cherry Orchard Site totally ignoring what several local property agents who have all confirmed that further business/office use is not required in this area and agreed that if a village, as submitted, had been approved this could have released further required housing stock instead of releasing further Green Belt land for more large residential developments as put forward for the proposed new Local Plan, which we all know will only contribute to further Global Warming.</li> </ol> <p>We therefore feel what is the use of SCI's when RDC take no notice of any comments put forward and all that is done is to insert any comments that are received, on the RDC Web Site which nobody can be bothered to look at.</p>	<p>We recognise concerns over consultations coinciding with holiday periods, however this SCI consultation ran for six weeks, the majority of which did not coincide with holiday periods.</p> <p>This consultation related to how future consultation will be undertaken in support of the South Essex Plan. Representations relating to specific developments and infrastructure concerns in Rochford are noted but are not within the scope of this consultation.</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
<b>David Randell</b>				
049	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	<p>I am pleased to see that there is a vehicle for coordinating plans across the region since I have been concerned that the devolvement of responsibility to local authorities is resulting in a narrow focus and politically driven non cohesive approach to requirements. However, the timings dictated by central Government and central planning at Bristol means that there is a disparity between the demands on the local authorities to present a local plan and your own timings to achieve a wider area structured plan.</p> <p>In my own area of South West Billericay, an as yet unapproved plan has already seen outline planning permission submitted for one site under consideration for housing development.</p> <p>The devolved structure is flawed since it results in housing developments being added to towns whose infrastructure is based on centuries old evolution not suitable for the twenty first century and utilising green belt currently performing a purpose around these towns. The requirement for housing and infrastructure renewal is similar to that which existed in 1950 at which point central Government took control and built new towns which were fit for purpose at that time. The same is true now and the same action required today.</p> <p>So the first step is to call a halt to the local plans and review on a more strategic regional level.</p> <p>There are four topics of concern that I see disjointed in my own area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need for more housing.</li> <li>• The additional Thames Crossing</li> <li>• Joining the existing motorway system to the new Thames crossing</li> <li>• The need created by the expanding DP World London Gateway</li> </ul> <p>Instead of destroying existing communities and imposing a burden on inadequate infrastructures, consideration should be given to building a new town that embraces new technologies of wind and solar energy, high speed fibre optics with roads and parking to match today's vehicle</p>	<p>Support for co-ordinated planning across South Essex is welcomed.</p> <p>This request is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities' standards for community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The South Essex Plan will be subject to its own consultation processes in accordance with the relevant regulations.</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>population [2 cars per household now, one car per 10 households in 1950] with parking to match the footprint of an SUV and not a small 1950s Ford.</p> <p>This new town to be built adjacent to the A128 corridor, close to DP gateway, close to the C2C rail and A13 routes to London and the A128 being upgraded to become the motorway link to the new Thames crossing.</p>	
<b>050</b>	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	<p>1.0 "CONSULTATION "</p> <p>In reality the Layman's input is limited to local knowledge due to the highly technical / legal aspects of the Planning process. However it is clear that the local knowledge carries little weight and is routinely ignored by RDC. This accounts for low level and diminishing response to Public Consultations, seen by the residents as a 'tick the box' compliance tool - to satisfy future Planning Inspector or QA Audits. This is clearly evidenced in the issues arising from the existing RDC Local Plan now underway in Construction. The publicly forecast impacts on the local area already emerging and continuing to cause increasing disruption.</p>	Comments noted. It is recognised that planning documents can be highly technical. While some of this is unavoidable the Councils will seek to make the information as easy to comprehend as possible.
<b>051</b>	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	<p>2.0 "THE BIGGER PICTURE "</p> <p>Given the foregoing, the concept of the Public giving meaningful input on a Project as vast as the South Essex Corridor- is not feasible (WHY?). The scale of the Project warranted a visionary and costed Joint Strategic Plan from the beginning; such that the six Council Local Plans would then achieve cohesion (NHS/ Law &amp; Order/Employment /Transport). What has actually happened is that the individual Council's have already pursued their own separate Plans, all at various stages of the NPPF process. The proposed retrospective South Essex Corridor Plan will be, at best, a dis-jointed compromise , and</p>	Comments noted. It recognised that the preparation of individual Local Plans has occurred at different speeds.

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			will probably be dominated by one issue, namely a tinkering with the A127 ( common denominator ).	
052	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	<p>3.0 "THE PROBLEM"</p> <p>The Government's edict on mass new housing was launched in a period of deep austerity measures and was therefore at odds with reality. The ever changing vehicle (the NPPF) for Planning was dumped on Local Authorities who lack the capacity to implement it. This was underlined by the Principal Consultee for Essex (ECC) who analysed the task and published the 2016 Growth &amp; Infrastructure Framework Report. The summary categorically defined a massive shortfall (£ Billions) in Infrastructure funding to support NPPF driven housing targets. Local Council's (typically RDC) are equally limited -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Land Supply</li> <li>* Funding</li> <li>* Expertise</li> <li>* A Planning culture of ' more of the same ' dogma by deferring to the Principal Consultee ( ECC ).</li> </ul> <p>Interestingly the Chelmsford Beauleigh Park development has achieved the largest single Infrastructure Fund award (£ 219 million) and is seen as best in class. However there would appear to be no cross-pollination of their style of Development to other Local Councils. This might well be because the Principal Consultee resides in Chelmsford</p>	Comments noted. These matters don't relate directly to the SCI.
053	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	<p>3. " SUMMARY "</p> <p>The now overdue ' Joint Strategic Plan ' will arrive too late to influence the existing multiple Local Plans now in the Construction stage. It is hoped that it will arrive in time to shape the (also late) integrated 'New' Local Plans?</p>	Comments noted. This does not directly relate to the SCI. The timetable for the Plan is kept under regular review.
M G Warren				

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
054	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	I feel it is about time that the council got its act together and sorted out the local plan. This was supposed to be sorted out a long time ago but then we had an election and the ruling party changed, and so does the planning policy. About 20 years ago the council missed the deadline by faffing around, and so nothing gets done. It looks to me that the only people to be able to get anything done are the so called traveling community, who do not want to live in bricks and mortar because they are travellers, but when given permission for 6 pitches this soon turns to 30 or 40 then strangely the mobile homes change to bricks and mortar, but the law abiding community cannot get planning permission.	Comments noted. The SCI relates to the South Essex Plan rather than the Local Plan.
<b>The Hullbridge Residents Association (Mr Brian Marsden-Carleton)</b>				
055	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	<p>In respond to your letter dated 16 December 2019 on behalf of the Hullbridge Community population of apoprox.7500, requesting our 'Statement of Community Involvement' (SCI) in respect of the proposed Southeast Plan setting out a strategic framework for development to 2038 which is deemed to be an addendum with amendments and additions to the adopted SCI of 2016.</p> <p>We refer to the Laws empowering the community to use the Freedom of Information Act, Localism Act (2011), The National Planning Policy Framework was amended and published in July 2019 but we are unable to find reference to this in your 'address of the SCI', your response will be appreciated, The National Planning Policy Framework as prescribed by the Communities and Local Government Act (March 2012) and as updated above, provides the framework for local people to produce their own Distinctive Local and Neighbourhood Plans affecting the needs and priorities of their communities (April 2012 but no updates given), and includes the Regulations Governing Neighbourhood Planning Laws, The Consultation procedures laid down in the Core Strategy and Site Allocation Documents, The Allocation DPD Document (Feb 2010) – Discussion &amp; Consultative Document on page 1 (Introduction) that the Council SCI is committed to Regulation 25 Public Participation in the preparation of Planning for the District.</p>	<p>This consultation relates to a proposed addendum to individual local authority's Statements of Community Involvement. The purpose of the addendum is set out, specifically, how consultation will be managed in the preparation of the South Essex Plan <b>only</b>. Individual authority's Statements of Community Involvement set out how local communities will be consulted in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The comments relating to the Freedom of Information Act are noted, however this is not considered to be relevant for the</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
				purposes of detailing how communities will be consulted on the preparation of the South Essex Plan.
056	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan	Comment	<p>Neighbourhood Planning (NP) amendments</p> <p>The "Addendum C"- Draft Neighbourhood Planning Addendum replacing paragraph 2.21 of the adopted SCI 2016 stated that "NP" was for guiding the future development and growth of a local area which can be produced by Parish, Town Councils and acceptable 'communities', governed by the Neighbourhood Planning (general) Regulations 2012. The Parish/Town Council are responsible for undertaking consultation and engagement during the preparation stage of NP's in accordance with the legislation and guidance. Item 1 (page 1) This NP was introduced by the "Localism Act" in 2011 and gives local communities new powers to take decisions to help shape and drive the development that takes place in their area. Would you agree this can be done by proven professionally qualified groups, by example, such as the Hullbridge Residents Association (HRA) as the RDC have accepted the Neighbourhood Forum for "Canewdon and Wallasea" as designated in the District (clause 9), and we (HRA) are concerned why Hullbridge have not been given the same opportunity, despite several requests to administer the Neighbourhood Planning Group (NPG) in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012, with the added advantage of seeking a Charitable status, with your approval, for funding purposes.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan and/or Development Order can only be prepared by a 'defined' neighbourhood Forum' we repeat that HRA are ideally equipped to administer this group in the same manner RDC have allowed for Canewdon and Wallasea. RDC and HPC were copied into this correspondence, and we have a robust 'constitution' in accordance with the CPALC 10-point Guiding Principles, along with professionally qualified and experienced committee members. HRA will abide by the 7</p>	<p>This consultation relates to a proposed addendum to each individual local authority's Statement of Community Involvement (SCIs). The purpose of the addendum is to set out, specifically, how consultation will be managed in the preparation of the South Essex Plan <b>only</b>. Individual authority's SCI already set out how local communities will be consulted in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans and these documents should be referred to for the requested information.</p> <p>Those aspects of the representation which relate to neighbourhood planning, infrastructure delivery, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and specific developments are noted. These comments are, however, not within the scope of</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>stages of the NP as set out in item 6, page 2. HRA objective is to deal with future issues concerning new developments. HRA letter dated 11.5.14 to RDC explained our understanding of “Supporting Communities in Neighbourhood Planning” with questions to each subject, and observing details and the important clauses crucial to the success of the NPG rules and regulations. The Hullbridge Parish Council (HPC) have stated that they are unable to administer projects due to lack of knowledge of planning matters and development on a large scale, HRA have respect for the HPC statement. HRA request good reason why RDC consider that we are unable to administer the NPG Neighbourhood Development Order HRA have been in discussions about our involvement with a Neighbourhood Development Board and/or NP Board, which we are happy to participate with, and we were hoping this would lead to some result.. Parish Boundary. HRA stated that RDC should review the Parish boundary between Hullbridge and Rawreth which we were instrumental in notifying the RDC that the review should have been conducted ‘before’ accepting the OPA on Mayons Lane, we are justified in requesting the credit for this oversight by RDC. Besides the fact that this is a ‘large development’ which the Parish council are not equipped to deal with as we have explained before, however once again we state that our proposal would have been a great benefit to RDC and HPC for HRA to administer the NPG, with our professional know how.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan – HRA are pleased to inform the community that we are part of the “Planning Forum” set up by our MP Mark Francois and chaired by the Councillor Ian Ward who is the Planning Portfolio Holder. HRA provided information on Evidence based preparation- community engagement, Identity aims &amp; issues, writing policies updating the plans as recommended and identify grants &amp; funds needed. Have RDC considered the impact on Hullbridge, with about 3,000 to 6,300 homes being developed, expanding our population from 7,500 to 32,500, we emphasise this is tantamount to over-</p>	<p>this consultation and therefore do not necessitate amendments to the addendum.</p> <p>In relation to those aspects of the representation relating to the ability of ASELA and the South Essex local authorities to effectively prepare and consult on a plan at the scale proposed, it is recognised that it will be important to ensure that consultation materials are coherent and that the relationship between the South Essex Plan, local plans and neighbourhood plans is clear. The South Essex authorities will endeavour to ensure that consultation materials are coherent and easy to understand to the layman. Where appropriate, the South Essex authorities will consider preparing additional resources such as glossaries, executive (or non-technical) summaries or frequently asked questions to assist in this process.</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>development. If HRA have had the foresight to provide advance information it should be of advantage to RDC and HPC to favour harmony with HRA for community benefit. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (Refer to the SCI 2016- page 10). This CIL is in accordance with Regulation 2010 (As amended) in particular the Charging Schedule Clauses 2.17 and 2.18. HRA ask if the CIL is mentioned in the Core Strategy and the NPPF? HRA are concerned with the insufficient consultation as to the "Evidence Base Preparation" and "Infrastructure Funding Gap Assessment" (Cl. 18), and the preliminary "Draft Charging Schedule" (Regulations 15 and 16). HRA have not had the opportunity to engage on the "Timetable" for the preparation of the CIL as set out in the Local Development Scheme.</p> <p>In consideration of the Malyons Lane development, now in construction, please provide us with the information as to how the CIL applies to the developer for incorporation of this Levy and what the sums of money are involved along with information on the Draft Charging Schedule to allow us an observation and comment opportunity. Will these charges be subject to consultation and agreement with the developer, and how will any shortfall be administered, the residents are concerned that the Council will find ways of burdening the community with the shortfall. HRA are pleased to observe RDC have resurrected the Localism Act which gives local communities new powers to make decisions to help shape and drive the development/s in the area.</p> <p>There is no definition on the words "Gives Communities the Power" or a clear meaning of 'communities'. HRA have submitted many issues in respect of Malyons Lane, which have been instrumental in amendments to the plans put forward by the developer and we remind RDC that HRA have been involved in all issues of developments since 2013 and our right to be consulted is appreciated. Many issues have not been resolved, specifically in relation to "Flood", existing "Drainage (foul and surface water)", and existing infrastructure which has been neglected</p>	<p>Your comments have been passed onto Rochford District Council for their consideration.</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>since 1968.  Road improvements  There is no mention of 'road improvements' to Watery Lane, which has a direct impact on the road network in Hullbridge. Can RDC explain why the CPO has not been used to widen Watery lane?  Several years ago HRA predicted that allocating two sites close together (Hullbridge and Rawreth) will cause chaos, and that has certainly come to pass and will continue for the next 10 to 15 years, or more if other developments are approved. Expansion-Homes, Population and effect on Insurance. Insurance. HRA provided RDC with likely costs for the properties to be at 'flood' risk by Insurance Companies, with costs to householders likely to be double the normal price unless satisfactory assessments and evidence is provided to the contrary.  New Homes Population  East Hullbridge 7 to 14 28 to 56  East Rawreth 1,773 to 3,545 7,092 to 14,180  West Hullbridge 926 to 1,350 3,704 to 5,400  North Hullbridge 537 to 1,074 2,152 to 4,304  South Hullbridge 134 to 268 536 to 1,072  Central Hullbridge 3,100 3,100 7,500 to 7,500 Existing.  Total 6,477 to 9,351 21,012 to 32,512</p> <p>The total population may be some 21,000 to 32,500 in 10 to 15 years. In consideration of what the Core Strategy and NPPF state, we say that Hullbridge will be classified as 'over-development' with a highly unsatisfactory road network causing extreme congestion with an estimated 14,000 vehicles at present, likely to expand to some 33,000+. Common sense and Engineering sense dictates that the existing infrastructure is totally inadequate and that the normal cycle of 5 year 'upgrading' has been neglected since 1968. The danger is of environmental, pollution and congestion issues having a substantial impact on Hullbridge, which is likely to be classified as a Town by</p>	

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>2021/2. Purchasers' Condition Reports for the developers of the Malyons Lane site indicated in their website that 79% of completed purchases had many faults or in a poor condition, it is not satisfactory for the largest purchase of peoples' lives. HRA suggest a NPG can assist in consultation with prospective purchasers. Inspection by the Local Authorities handing over responsibility to the developers has it's own consequences. Recently one of our MP's wrote an article about this very subject including the Housing Association in Partnership with the Local Authority, who offer an incentive to the Local Authority in return for approval of plans. RDC should consider the consequences. HRA also ask the Planning Inspector to investigate the Section 106 'shortfall' we predicted by our statement in the SCI of 2014, but never resolved, particularly affecting our 'medical services' for which we provided financial information.</p> <p>Assessments  A Planning Consultant invited HRA to visit an Environment Consultant in Bristol, and pending the final results, we are satisfied that the Consultants are a reputable Company, and will produce a Report on Environment in and around Hullbridge. A 'Statement' made below is on behalf of an HRA community member. We are concerned that Mr Bentley (of ECC) – using words such as “ The E.C.C. “generally works with Councils to undertake transport modelling to support Local Plan” this is a smoke-screen but picked up because it seems to emphasise ‘cohesion’ between the County and District councils, not the community, and it continues “Gives confidence and reassurance in identifying up-front the required Developer’s funded transport mitigation measure!” the Oxford dictionary says to “mitigate” is to appease/ moderate/alleviate/reduce severity of ...” so, in his own words, he admits they try to appease/ moderate and reduce severity of the Developer’s required funding. Mr Bentley chose his own words and they mean zero of course, as for the worry of, if it backfires, we will</p>	

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>have to pay, or our Council will, but will ignore the community. He needs to know there was a fatal accident in Hockley a few days ago, due to large lorries. There were historically, also two in Hullbridge, at least to my knowledge, a man died on Lower Road because of 'no crossing' at the top of the hill near the garage, and a little girl knocked down on the crossing outside One Stop shop on Ferry Road. Yes, it would be nice to use sustainable bicycles safely, how about ECC or RDC finishing the half cycle path up to Hambro Hill or put a proper footpath along whole of Lower Road -as children live there and go to the football club etc .</p> <p>Facts  We experienced delays on our way to our shopping trip to Asda (Rawreth) - long queue at Malyons development reaching beyond the garage on Lower Road and to Golf Course on Hullbridge road. To make matters worse, from mini roundabout at Hambro shops as far as to the development on Rawreth Lane -static queues of traffic both sides and to run the 'gauntlet' to avoid the pot holes which seem to be 'repaired in patches' close to each other, when one large repair, incorporating all the holes would save our tax payers money in the long run, and only resulting in a smooth ride for a while before the same holes have to be repaired repeatedly.</p> <p>Mr Bentley should remember that there is only a single primary school in Hullbridge and we have no choice but to travel for secondary schools we will be angry if the Salvage Yard goes ahead without any funding for a pelican crossing opposite it -as it is so dangerous . We did see Mark Francois belated article -half page- about the stupidity of overload and simultaneous developments. Bit late Mark, and looked like a quick tick of the box effort.</p> <p>We must add that HRA have no confidence that their comments and professionally grounded concerns have been given proper consideration. So we invite Mr. Bentley to consider his word announcing that you "Generally" work with Councils to identify</p>	

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>required transport measures, but without consulting with the community 'representatives'. Also if you seek to "reassure" the Residents, sitting on the bus in long daily traffic jams merely to go to a local high school or local hospital appointment, we only repeat- we have not been given any indication of even being heard when we do bother to send in our legally allowed points of view or objections individually or through our HRA representatives. Stand in our shoes Mr Bentley, without taking any biased views and read the several documents submitted by HRA that the Local Plan "Call for sites" shows the influx of 24 further developments around our tiny riverside village, with the possible population 'explosion' which is deemed to be 'over development according to the NPPF. We are all being boxed in as the road structures are inadequate and therefore dangerous if overloaded, despite a quickly added roundabout at the entrance to the New Estate, -this only looks good on paper but does nothing to alleviate the extra traffic itself flowing through the same width of 'B' roads and 'Watery Lane'. All we hope is for fair treatment and Councils can confidently be assured they will regret this crazy concreting over the area, affecting the 'environment' generally. Further 'contribution' by a learned community member of Rayleigh (JC)</p> <p>"Consultation"</p> <p>In keeping with your website invitation I submit my representation (South East Essex Plan) via email as follows:- In reality the layman's input is limited to local knowledge due to the highly technical/ legal aspects of the planning process. However it is clear that the local knowledge carries little weight and is/was routinely ignored by RDC, despite some strong professional submissions by HRA on the whole process over a seven year period.</p> <p>This accounts for low level and diminishing 'individual' response to the so-called "Public Consultations", and seen by the residents as a 'tick-the-box' compliance 'tool' to satisfy the Planning Inspector or 'quality</p>	

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>Assurance Audits in accordance with the CS and NPPF documents, please respect that this SCI submission is on behalf of the 7.500 plus Hullbridge community with collaboration from some Rawreth and Rayleigh community, we ask you not to make the same mistake as you did before, classifying this submission as from an 'individual', note the 'Stakeholder' and Community References' stated at the head of this letter. This is clearly evidenced in the issues arising from the existing RDC Local Plan now being produced. The publicly forecast impacts on the local area already emerging and continuing to cause increasing alarm and disruption in 'over-development' and 'congestion'.</p> <p>The bigger picture.  Given the foregoing, the concept of the Public giving meaningful input on Projects as vast in numbers as the South Essex Corridor is not feasible (WHY) – the scale of these projects (including those put forward by the "Call for Sites") warrant a visionary and costed Joint Strategy Plan from the beginning, such that the six Council Local Plans would then achieve cohesion including NHS/ Law and Order / Employment / Transport. Is any Council really listening to their communities, by past experience we think not, making a mockery of the word "CONSULTATION" as defined previously by HRA. With so many errors being made by the Local Authorities, as witnessed by the London fires and nationwide floods, it seems that the councils wilfully dismiss any meaningful submissions put forward by the community. We can understand the 'incentive' motive of 'completed homes' exercised by the LA. What has actually happened is that the individual Councils have already pursued their own separate plans, all at various stages of the NPPF process. The proposed 'retrospective South East Corridor Plan' will be at best a completely disjointed compromise and will probably be dominated by one issue, namely some warped idea of 'reconstructing the A127 and some ill-thought tributaries which will affect existing communities one way or another and dominating the SEC Plan. Please</p>	

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>take note what HRA have stated several times that Hullbridge is likely to be 'overdeveloped' and have submitted calculations to that effect, imagine the same in percentage terms for the forecast 75,000 homes.</p> <p>The problem.</p> <p>The Governments edict on mass new housing was launched in a period of deep austerity measures and therefor was at odds with reality. The everchanging vehicle (NPPF) for planning was dumped on Local Authorities who lack the capacity to implement it or to address any new plans being forwarded to them as witnessed by HRA expressing a lack of proper administration with regard to proper pre-qualification of prospective developers and other issues recorded in our early submissions. This was underlined by the Principal Consultee for Essex (ECC) who analysed the task and published the 2016 Growth and Infrastructure Framework Report. The summary categorically defined a massive shortfall (£Billions) in Infrastructure funding to support NPPF driven housing targets. Local Councils (typically RDC) are equally limited with regard to "Land Supply", "Funding", "Expertise" with a planning culture of 'more of the same dogma' by deferring to the main Principal Consultee (ECC). Interesting to note that the Chelmsford Beaulieu Park Development (a favoured development) has achieved the largest single Infrastructure Fund award of £219m and is being seen as the best in its class. However there appears to be no 'cross-pollination in the same principal for developments in other Local Councils, we wonder if this 'principal' suits the appropriate clauses within the NPPF which is supposed to promote a 'level-playing field', perhaps because the Principal resides in Chelmsford. We wonder if the Planning Inspector will take this into account when making his deliberation.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>The now overdue 'Joint Strategic Plan' will arrive too late to influence the existing multiple Local Plans now being produced. We can only</p>	

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			'hope' this will arrive in time to shape the integrated New Local Plans (also late in delivery). HRA hope that our community are showing the way to 'integrated' cohesion. The Hullbridge Residents Association look forward to a robust dialogue and consultation on all issues concerning the above.	
<b>Ms Vanessa Carter</b>				
<b>057</b>	Introduction	Comment	The South Essex Plan does not meet the criteria of being consistent with national policy as Billericay residents had not seen the revised plan Regulation 18 (published 2018) prior to publication of Regulation 19, despite Basildon Council having the opportunity to do so. Billericay residents overwhelmingly rejected the 2016 Local Plan of 1,800 additional houses on green belt land. The revised plan revealed an additional 1,000 houses to pay for a relief road without public consultation (60% increase) so now over 2,800. The community has been given a greater role in planning and their opinion must not be ignored by Councils/Government.	<p>This is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities' standards for community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The South Essex Plan will be subject to its own consultation processes in accordance with the relevant regulations.</p> <p>The Basildon Borough Revised Publication Local Plan Statement of Consultation March 2019 sets out how the Council carried out its consultation process on the Revised Publication Local Plan, and summarises the results of the consultation.</p>
<b>058</b>	Important Note	Comment	Over 50% of Basildon boroughs greenbelt loss is in Billericay which is disproportionately targeted. There is no government requirement or justification to build any housing on green belt sites. All housing development across South East Essex must be designated to brownfield sites only with green belt preserved and removed from the plan.	Comments are noted. This is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities' standards for community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
				Plan. The South Essex Plan will be subject to its own consultation processes in accordance with the relevant regulations.
059	Background	Comment	The revised local plan grossly exceeds the OAN for Billericay and the Borough. The plan is reckless and irresponsible in proposing high density housing in a small area, mainly on and adjacent to Tye Common Road. This is not sustainable and will result in as many as 8,000 additional cars creating gridlocks. No new jobs are being generated so people will have to commute and Network Rail Great Eastern have confirmed (Jul 19) that it cannot accommodate any additional services at peak times. Services will be at breaking point with developments in Billericay, Wickford and along the Southend train line.	<p>Comments are noted. This is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities' standards for community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The South Essex Plan will be subject to its own consultation processes in accordance with the relevant regulations.</p> <p>The Basildon Borough Revised Publication Local Plan Statement of Consultation March 2019 sets out how the Council carried out its consultation process on the Revised Publication Local Plan, and summarises</p>
060	How we will Consult	Comment	Any public exhibitions or stakeholder workshops must be held on a Saturday and or Sunday to include the majority who are working on weekdays and those who commute into London.	"How we will consult has been amended" with "at different times and locations" added to the penultimate bullet. This is considered to give sufficient flexibility to cover weekends and evenings.
<b>Iceni Projects (Leona Hannify) on behalf of EA Strategic Land (SASL)</b>				

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
061	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>a. Introduction</p> <p>EASL have held interests in the region for more than a decade, with a portfolio of sites across South Essex. It is estimated that on the EASL land within the region there is the potential for c. 15,000 homes to be delivered, in addition to associated infrastructure, jobs, schools, services etc. Our client is eager to bring forward these sites for development delivering transformational change this region seeks, which is aligned with the core objectives of the ASELA. The importance of this region for the future of the national economy is evidenced in the work of the Thames Estuary 2050 Growth Commission and the call for urgent action therein. Moreover, the 'South Essex 2050 Ambition' sets out the opportunity for growth and development across the sub-region and the positive effect it will have on the economy, together with the right scale and type of infrastructure to support growth. This is all wholly supported by EASL. Consequently, our client welcomes the preparation of the SEP and the collaborative working between the adjoining authorities in order to accelerate growth and start delivering the infrastructure, the homes, the jobs and amenities the people of South Essex need. EASL is keen to work with the authorities to make South Essex "the place to live, the destination to visit and the place for business to thrive". The purpose of these representations is to identify the key matters for consideration in the emerging SEP in so far as they relate to community and stakeholder involvement.</p>	Support for a South Essex Plan and a standardised approach to community involvement is noted.
062	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>b. Timescales for the SEP</p> <p>The ongoing delays associated with plan making in South Essex is having a significant impact on the delivery of housing in the region. Urgent action is required by the ASELA to address this. This is needed in order to provide investors and promoters with a level of certainty in the process to ensure they engage and deliver the investment required in order to support the growth of the region. EASL acknowledge that this is a challenging process. It is imperative that due process is followed which takes considerable time given the range of parties involved.</p>	The Timescale of the JSP is kept under regular review.

**Commented [R1]:** This is one for JOG to agree a way forward. Iceni are raising concerns about the timetable of the JSP and that the timetable should be included in the SCI. Not sure that the authorities are reflecting the timetable in their SCIs. Is this one for a LDS and the SoCG?

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>However, as the previous milestones from the SoCG (June 2018) are now out of date, a realistic and deliverable set of milestones and the timescales for the delivery of the SEP would be welcomed. The SOCG (June 2018) stated that : “ASELA has agreed an accelerated timetable for preparing the plan given the urgent need to implement the shared ambition, building investor confidence and ensuring the right infrastructure is secured to support delivery of the strategic spatial and economic priorities. There are risks attached to delivery of the JSP within this timescale, however, particularly as it will be dependent on significant infrastructure investment”.</p> <p>The issue that has arisen is that the continued delays in the process have resulted in less confidence by our clients in the region as the plan making timescales are continuously in a state of flux. The current consultation indicates that an ‘Issues’ consultation will take place in Summer '20, to inform the preparation of a Preferred Options document which will be the next stage in the Plan Making progress. Further details on the subsequent consultation phases would be welcomed. In this regard, it would be very helpful for the SCI to be updated to include a clear timetable detailing when consultations will be undertaken and the purpose / nature of each consultation stage.</p>	
063	Background		<p>c. National Policy &amp; Evidence Base</p> <p>The Consultation confirms that the SEP is a Joint Strategic Plan that will form part of the statutory planning framework for South Essex. The Plan has to be prepared in line with national regulations and will be subject to an Examination in Public by an independent Inspector. In this regard it is imperative that the Plan adheres to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and is robust, consistent and objective in terms of the evidence base collation.</p> <p>Spatial Strategy The Consultation further states that the Plan will set out the areas overarching spatial strategy, housing target and distribution, strategic development and employment opportunity areas and key transport and other infrastructure priorities. It is evident from</p>	<p>Noted. This is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities’ standards for community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The South Essex Plan will be subject to its own consultation processes in</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>the Planning Inspectorate's reporting following the examination of Plans, and in accordance with para 15 of the Framework, that at the outset of the plan making process a clear, high-level spatial strategy for South Essex is required which identifies how housing, employment and other development should be broadly distributed. The spatial strategy is the foundation of the Plan and thus all future decisions flow from this. In this respect, it needs to be set out clearly and consulted on from the outset. The previous SCI indicated that the spatial strategy and how the longer term housing needs will be met will be set out in further iterations of the SCI as Plan preparation progresses. We note that the current consultation provides no further details of the spatial strategy. It is understood that the emerging evidence base will need to inform the spatial strategy – it is queried whether the Issues consultation expected in Summer 2020 will include further details of the spatial strategy.</p> <p>Evidence Base</p> <p>The Framework requires the SEP to be justified in terms of an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence; and effective ensuring that it will be deliverable over the plan period, all of which needs to be supported by a proportionate evidence base. The Consultation states that a broad range of specially commissioned evidence as well as that which was already publicly available will inform the Plan. It would be helpful to understand the extent of the evidence that has been commissioned, and when this will be published during the Plan process.</p>	<p>accordance with the relevant regulations.</p> <p>The current SCI will not include any further detail on the spatial strategy but a brief summary may be included in future iterations.</p> <p>The South Essex Plan will be subject to its own consultation processes in accordance with the relevant regulations. The first stage of consultation will be an Issues Report that will identify the key issues to be considered in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The document includes options to be considered in developing a spatial strategy.</p>
064	Who we consult with		<p>d. Stakeholder Engagement</p> <p>The current consultation states that the Association will consult statutory organisations including local, town and parish councils, infrastructure providers and Government bodies as legally required or otherwise appropriate. This is welcomed as clearly the statutory consultees have the potential to accelerate the delivery of growth in the region and need to be involved from the outset. The preparation of</p>	<p>Comment noted. ASELA has already begun engagement with MHCLG and the Planning Inspectorate to provide critical friend/ sense checking during the preparation of the South Essex Plan</p>

Commented [R2]: Any further comment to add?

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			a SEP remains a significant learning curve for both plan makers and the industry. To provide a level of comfort, on a without prejudice basis, it is queried whether there is an opportunity for sense checking / critical friend role from the Planning Inspectorate or MHCLG throughout the process. In an ideal scenario such an advisor would have no other input in the Plan but simply to provide a critique at the various consultation stages to ascertain compliance with the Framework.	
065	When we will consult		<p>e. Transparency A further consideration in respect of the SCI is whether there may be increased transparency in respect of the nature of the work being undertaken by the ASELA; the evidence base; and in particular the timescales for the process and the reasoning for slippage. EASL welcomes the publication of the website particularly if this is an indication that further information on the work of the Association will be made available online. In addition to sharing the technical information, it is queried whether the meeting minutes from the ASELA, similar to Local Plan Committee Meetings, could be made public. This may also assist with the Duty to Cooperate issue on the Local Plans which will be subject to an independent examination while the SEP is being prepared.</p> <p>f. Conclusion EASL has a vested long-term interest in this region with ambitious plans and is excited to work with the ASELA to deliver a Plan which will act as linchpin for the future growth of South Essex up to 2050. We would welcome the opportunity to engage with the ASELA and the consultant team at the appropriate juncture.</p>	<p>The South Essex Plan website will continue to be updated and new evidence base material made available when completed. The timetable for the Plan is kept under regular review, taking into account the need for speed alongside the importance of producing a robust document that is appropriate for public examination.</p> <p>ASELA is a relatively new organisation which continues to evolve and adapt to a rapidly changing internal and external context. It is recognised that internal procedures and the communication of the work of ASELA require improving and this is being addressed.</p> <p>Comment noted. The authorities are willing as far as possible to</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
				work positively with all interested parties
<b>Iceni Projects (Leona Hannify) on behalf of Cogent Land</b>				
066	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>On behalf of our client, Cogent Land LLP, we wish to submit representations in relation the Statement of Community Involvement Addendum for the South Essex Plan (SEP).</p> <p>a. Introduction</p> <p>Cogent have been active in the South Essex region since 2007 with extensive landholdings in the region particularly focused in Southend, Rochford and Thurrock, including the submission of a number of planning applications which have been held in abeyance. It is estimated that on the Cogent land within the region there is the potential for c. 20,000 homes to be delivered, in addition to associated infrastructure, jobs, schools, services etc. Our client is eager to bring forward these sites for development delivering transformational change this region seeks, which is aligned with the core objectives of the ASELA. The importance of this region for the future of the national economy is evidenced in the work of the Thames Estuary 2050 Growth Commission and the call for urgent action therein. Moreover, the 'South Essex 2050 Ambition' sets out the opportunity for growth and development across the sub-region and the positive effect it will have on the economy, together with the right scale and type of infrastructure to support growth. This is all wholly supported by Cogent. Consequently, our client welcomes the preparation of the SEP and the collaborative working between the adjoining authorities in order to accelerate growth and start delivering the infrastructure, the homes, the jobs and amenities the people of South Essex need. Cogent is keen to work with the authorities to make South Essex "the place to live, the destination to visit and the place for business to thrive". The purpose of these representations is to identify the key matters for consideration in the</p>	Comments noted. The authorities are willing as far as possible to work positively with all interested parties

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			emerging SEP in so far as they relate to community and stakeholder involvement.	
067	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>b. Timescales for the SEP</p> <p>The ongoing delays associated with plan making in South Essex is having a significant impact on the delivery of housing in the region. Urgent action is required by the ASELA to address this. This is needed in order to provide investors and promoters with a level of certainty in the process to ensure they engage and deliver the investment required in order to support the growth of the region. Cogent acknowledge that this is a challenging process. It is imperative that due process is followed which takes considerable time given the range of parties involved. However, as the previous milestones from the SoCG (June 2018) are now out of date, a realistic and deliverable set of milestones and the timescales for the delivery of the SEP would be welcomed. The SOCG (June 2018) stated that : "ASELA has agreed an accelerated timetable for preparing the plan given the urgent need to implement the shared ambition, building investor confidence and ensuring the right infrastructure is secured to support delivery of the strategic spatial and economic priorities. There are risks attached to delivery of the JSP within this timescale, however, particularly as it will be dependent on significant infrastructure investment". The issue that has arisen is that the continued delays in the process have resulted in less confidence by our clients in the region as the plan making timescales are continuously in a state of flux. The current consultation indicates that an 'Issues' consultation will take place in Summer '20, to inform the preparation of a Preferred Options document which will be the next stage in the Plan Making progress. Further details on the subsequent consultation phases would be welcomed. In this regard, it would be very helpful for the SCI to be updated to include a clear timetable detailing when consultations will be undertaken and the purpose / nature of each consultation stage.</p>	Comments relating to the timetable for the South Essex Plan are noted. An update to each authority's Local Development Scheme (LDS) will be prepared in due course setting out a new timetable. It is expected that this timetable will provide the level of information being requested.

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
068	Background		<p>c. National Policy &amp; Evidence Base</p> <p>The Consultation confirms that the SEP is a Joint Strategic Plan that will form part of the statutory planning framework for South Essex. The Plan has to be prepared in line with national regulations and will be subject to an Examination in Public by an independent Inspector. In this regard it is imperative that the Plan adheres to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and is robust, consistent and objective in terms of the evidence base collation.</p> <p>Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The Consultation further states that the Plan will set out the areas overarching spatial strategy, housing target and distribution, strategic development and employment opportunity areas and key transport and other infrastructure priorities. It is evident from the Planning Inspectorate's reporting following the examination of Plans, and in accordance with para 15 of the Framework, that at the outset of the plan making process a clear, high-level spatial strategy for South Essex is required which identifies how housing, employment and other development should be broadly distributed. The spatial strategy is the foundation of the Plan and thus all future decisions flow from this. In this respect, it needs to be set out clearly and consulted on from the outset. The previous SCI indicated that the spatial strategy and how the longer term housing needs will be met will be set out in further iterations of the SCI as Plan preparation progresses. We note that the current consultation provides no further details of the spatial strategy. It is understood that the emerging evidence base will need to inform the spatial strategy – it is queried whether the Issues consultation expected in Summer 2020 will include further details of the spatial strategy.</p> <p>Evidence Base</p> <p>The Framework requires the SEP to be justified in terms of an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence; and effective ensuring that it will</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>In preparing the South Essex Plan, the South Essex authorities will have regard to national policy and legislative requirements to ensure that the final plan is both legally compliant and sound. To ensure this happens, the South Essex authorities are committed to developing a suite of technical evidence base documents.</p> <p>It is expected that further detail of these evidence base documents will be published, when available, to support future rounds of public consultation on the South Essex Plan.</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			be deliverable over the plan period, all of which needs to be supported by a proportionate evidence base. The Consultation states that a broad range of specially commissioned evidence as well as that which was already publicly available will inform the Plan. It would be helpful to understand the extent of the evidence that has been commissioned, and when this will be published during the Plan process.	
069	Who we will consult		<p>d. Stakeholder Engagement</p> <p>The current consultation states that the Association will consult statutory organisations including local, town and parish councils, infrastructure providers and Government bodies as legally required or otherwise appropriate. This is welcomed as clearly the statutory consultees have the potential to accelerate the delivery of growth in the region and need to be involved from the outset. The preparation of a SEP remains a significant learning curve for both plan makers and the industry. To provide a level of comfort, on a without prejudice basis, it is queried whether there is an opportunity for sense checking / critical friend role from the Planning Inspectorate or MHCLG throughout the process. In an ideal scenario such an advisor would have no other input in the Plan but simply to provide a critique at the various consultation stages to ascertain compliance with the Framework.</p>	Comments noted. The South Essex local authorities will engage with organisations such as the Planning Inspectorate and MHCLG where it is appropriate to do so.
070	When we will consult		<p>e. Transparency</p> <p>A further consideration in respect of the SCI is whether there may be increased transparency in respect of the nature of the work being undertaken by the ASELA; the evidence base; and in particular the timescales for the process and the reasoning for slippage. Cogent welcomes the publication of the website particularly if this is an indication that further information on the work of the Association will be made available online. In addition to sharing the technical information, it is queried whether the meeting minutes from the ASELA, similar to Local Plan Committee Meetings, could be made public. This may also assist with the Duty to Cooperate issue on the Local Plans which will be subject to an independent examination while the SEP is</p>	<p>e) Interest in the work of ASELA is welcomed.</p> <p>The South Essex Plan website will continue to be updated and new evidence base material made available when completed. The timetable for the Plan is kept under regular review, taking into account the need for speed alongside the importance of producing a robust document that</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>being prepared.</p> <p>f. Conclusion</p> <p>Cogent has a vested long-term interest in this region with ambitious plans and is excited to work with the ASELA to deliver a Plan which will act as linchpin for the future growth of South Essex up to 2050.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to engage with the ASELA and the consultant team at the appropriate juncture.</p>	<p>is appropriate for public examination.</p> <p>ASELA is a relatively new organisation which continues to evolve and adapt to a rapidly changing internal and external context. It is recognised that internal procedures and the communication of the work of ASELA require improving and this is being addressed.</p> <p>f) The interest of Cogent is noted. We would welcome the opportunity for further dialogue on matters of mutual interest.</p>
<b>Mr Gavin Taylor</b>				
071	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>Each Council has an ongoing Local Plan. What is the aim of this when Councils cannot agree between them now and are cutting up the countryside? We need a better overall plan which I think this could achieve with buy in from each Council, BUT it needs to have each Local Plan included in it. Infrastructure in Essex is at capacity now so where re the extra roads going to be built, cycle and walkways only go so far, and we have a growing airport at Southend which will cause commuter issues on the trains</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Each authority has to produce a Local Plan. The South Essex Plan seeks to address key cross-border issues.</p>
<b>Forestry Commission (Neil Jarvis, Local Partnership Advisor)</b>				
072	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>Thank you for consulting the Forestry Commission on the Statement of Community Involvement. As a non-statutory consultee, the Forestry Commission is pleased to provide you with the inserted links, information that may be helpful when you consider site allocations or</p>	<p>Comments and information noted.</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of Government Policy relating to ancient woodland</li> <li>• Information on the importance and designation of ancient woodland</li> </ul> <p>Ancient woodlands are irreplaceable. They have great value because they have a long history of woodland cover, with many features remaining undisturbed. This applies both to Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS). It is Government policy to refuse development that will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland, unless “there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists” (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 175 amended July 2018).</p> <p>Please note that the county of Essex, and in particular South Essex has more ancient woodland and veteran trees than any county in East England. Not all of the ancient woodlands are protected by the status of being designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest nevertheless all the ancient woodlands are biodiversity assets of the highest value for the county.</p>	
073	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>We refer you to further technical information set out in Natural England and Forestry Commission’s Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland – plus supporting Assessment Guide and Case Decisions. As a Non Ministerial Government Department, we provide no opinion supporting or objecting to a policy, an application or site allocation. Rather we are including information on the potential impact that development would have on the ancient woodland. If the planning authority takes the decision to approve an applications which may impact on Ancient Woodland sites we may be able to give further support in developing appropriate conditions in relation to woodland management mitigation or compensation measures. Please note however that the Standing Advice states that “Ancient woodland or veteran trees are irreplaceable, so you should not consider proposed compensation measures as part of your assessment of the benefits of the</p>	Comments noted.

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>development proposal". We suggest that you take regard of any points provided by Natural England about the biodiversity of any such woodland.</p> <p>The resilience of existing and new woodland is a key theme of the Forestry Commission's work to Protect, Improve and Expand woodland in England we will continue to work with Forestry / Woodland owners, agents, contractors and other Stakeholders to highlight and identify, pests and diseases and to work in partnership to enable Woodlands and Forests are resilient to the impacts of Climate Change.</p> <p>We hope these comments are helpful to you</p>	
<b>Natural England (Chris Gordon)</b>				
	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 16 December 2019 Which was received by Natural England on 16 December 2019. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. We are supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the general community, community organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters, both in terms of shaping policy and participating in the process of determining planning applications.</p> <p>We regret we are unable to comment, in detail, on individual Statements of Community Involvement but information on the planning service we offer, including advice on how to consult us, can be found at: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals">https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals</a>.</p>	Comments noted
<b>Mrs Deborah Taylor</b>				
075	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>My husband has just lodged his principle comment on the online portal. Unfortunately our PC will not let me add a separate comment as it is linked to his account that he registered. Please accept this email of my comment about the SCI and how the whole of Essex Councils need to liaise and work with each other to ensure that Essex has the right</p>	Thanks for your comments which are noted.

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>infrastructure for all to be able to live, work and travel around the county. As it is, each Local Authority is not working in tandem with any other Local Authority on each Local Plan, and how this impacts the their own and the next Borough's residents</p> <p>The SCI should be the start of planning and each Local Plan built into this, not the other way around.</p>	
<b>Office of Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner (Mr Darren Horsman)</b>				
<b>076</b>	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner, Essex Police and Essex County Fire and Rescue Authority response to the Thurrock Statement of Community Involvement and Statement of Community Involvement Addendum (South Essex Plan). This response is sent further to the letter sent on the 2nd of August 2019, from Roger Hirst, BJ Harrington, Jo Turton and Dorothy Hosein, which outlined the desire of all emergency services to work in close partnership with local authorities in respect of planning requirements, including development of Local Plans.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Thurrock Statement of Community Involvement and Statement of Community Involvement Addendum (South Essex Plan).</p>	<p>Comments noted. We welcome the fact that the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner wishes to work in partnership with the Local Planning Authorities.</p>
<b>077</b>	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>The Local Policing Body, referred to in this document as the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner, is identified as a specific consultee. We believe that Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and Essex Police should also be included as statutory consultees and until this is the case each we request that all emergency services be regarded as key stakeholders, and given the opportunity to engage in early two-way dialogue in respect of Local Plans.</p> <p>There should be clear reference within the document as to how Policing and Fire and Rescue issues are identified and managed. This is not clear in the current draft and we are seeking an increase in the references to our involvement throughout the process. There are significant benefits to involving both Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and Essex Police in the pre-planning stage, to ensure plans are cognisant of risk, community safety and Fire and Rescue.</p>	<p>The South Essex authorities would wish to actively work with the Local Policing Body as part of "Duty to Co-operate".</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
078	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>As key stakeholders and providers of essential, and potentially life-saving, services we believe that the most appropriate form of involvement is through direct conversations. We would expect to be notified directly of opportunities to engage and comment on published draft Local Plans. When draft plans are prepared we consider that the best outcomes can be achieved by ensuring that face-to-face conversations take place during the development stages. Whilst some aspects of community safety might benefit from wider stakeholder discussion, we do not consider general workshop scenarios to be an appropriate forum to discuss and determine the importance of facilitating access to and basic provision of emergency services. This requires a bespoke and dedicated input to plans and the opportunity to discuss the challenges presented so that, as statutory agencies with a responsibility to the public, we can collaboratively ensure that they are best served and protected.</p> <p>At a more local level, it is also appropriate to have the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner, Police and Fire and Rescue services included as consultees for Neighbourhood Plans. We would also expect the Ambulance Service to have a similar role.</p> <p>Recognising the importance of being able to provide emergency services to all residents of Essex, we have already developed some views on the intended content of Local Plans in the county. Further to the letter referred to above, we would like to take the opportunity to outline some of the views which we currently hold.</p>	Comments noted. While resources are limited, the authorities will actively seek to engage with the emergency services on a one to one basis.
079	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>We encourage the Council to adopt a wide definition of infrastructure which, in line with the Governments view of infrastructure expressed in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG), can include any impacts on Essex Police and Fire operational and set up costs associated with its services and not just built infrastructure provision. We applaud the approach of Mid Sussex District Council's adopted Local Plan and SPDs which plans for Police and Fire infrastructure requirements within its policies and SPDs and makes clear that infrastructure extends to include:</p>	Comments noted. A Strategic Infrastructure Position Statement has already been prepared and will be further developed as preparation of the Plan proceeds into a Delivery Plan. This will be prepared in liaison with key infrastructure bodies.

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>Staff, Premises</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicles and</li> <li>• Other infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>Any additional population generated by development will place an increased demand on the level of policing and fire and rescue services for the area. It is therefore essential that policies in the Local Plan make adequate provision for appropriate infrastructure planning, and mechanisms to secure new infrastructure or contributions towards both services.</p> <p>To maintain current levels of policing, developer contributions towards the provision of capital infrastructure will be required, as Essex Police do not have capacity and funding ability to respond to growth caused by additional housing.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework legislation specially chapter 8 (section 91b) places a statutory requirement on developers to consult with emergency and other services to ensure developments support healthy and safe communities. In line with this it is important that community safety is included as a criteria in all planning processes. There should also be an explicit intention to improve and not erode community safety within all planning decisions.</p>	<p>It will be for Local Plans to address detailed developer contribution policies.</p>
080	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>It is also important to include the impact on both prevention of and response to fire incidents included in all planning processes. In respect of fire services there should be regard to fire safety and prevention in planning and design. In addition, adequate access for fire fighting vehicles and equipment from the public highway must be available, as well as provision of an adequate supply of water for firefighting (which may, on occasions, require planning conditions or planning obligations to be imposed).</p> <p>It should be noted that contributions may be sought via a planning obligation towards the provision of emergency service bases – be it new multi-agency/shared use buildings, new police and/or fire stations or the extension/refurbishment of an existing building, to ensure that the</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed. The authorities will work collaboratively with the emergency services in the preparation of the South Essex Plan.</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>nationally prescribed standards of police and fire cover for the area are met.</p> <p>The PFCC, Essex Police and Essex County Fire and Rescue Service are seeking to work collaboratively with all local authorities in the county to ensure a comprehensive approach to infrastructure provision. We expect that impacts on the existing Police and Fire operational services and infrastructure, and any future requirements, are acknowledged within the Local Plan rather than being dealt with in a reactionary ad-hoc manner through the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>The PFCC, Essex Police and Essex County Fire and Rescue Service wishes to actively engage in further dialogue in the remaining stages of Local Plan preparation.</p>	
<b>Network Rail SE (Laura Mellon, Town Planner Property)</b>				
081	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		Please can you add Network Rail SE to the consultation list for the South Essex Plan as we would like to be kept involved in the process.	Comment noted. Network Rail will be added to the consultation database.
<b>Historic England (Mr Andrew Marsh, Planning Advisor)</b>				
082	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		Thank you for consulting us on the South Essex Strategic Plan, Statement of Community Involvement Addendum consultation. Whilst we do not have any specific comments at this stage we thank you for making us aware of the SCI addendum and can advise that we will be interested in receiving subsequent consultations on this matter.	Comments noted. Historic England will be consulted at all stages in the plan preparation process.
<b>Highways Agency (Janice Burgess) see Rep No 045</b>				
083	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and, as such, Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs, as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. We will therefore	Comments noted.

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN	
	When we will consult		We are keen to work collaboratively with the South Essex boroughs and Essex County Council on the South Essex Plan. Please ensure that Highways England are included in any future meetings for either the Thurrock Local Plan or South Essex Plan.	<p>The respondent will be consulted and engaged during the preparation of the South Essex Plan as part of the Duty to Cooperate arrangements that will include meetings and workshops.</p> <p>The respondent to be included on the consultee database for the South Essex Plan and consulted at all public stages of plan preparation.</p>
<b>Mr David Collis</b>				
<b>084</b>	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>I am writing to give you my feedback on the plans for the local area of Billericay. We moved here from Hornchurch just over 6 years ago after living in Hornchurch for 30 years, when we moved to Hornchurch it was just like Billericay, a really nice place to live, this all changed with building on any little patch of land, tall blocks of flats were built, but no new schools, no Doctors, no new roads, no new hospital, this meant that every service was over used under staffed, and it takes a long time to even try to drive out of the area.</p> <p>Our daughter also moved from Hornchurch a short time after us, it took over a Year to get her two daughters into junior school, during this time the whole family had to take turns in driving back and forth to the school in Hornchurch, not something that was safe as we had to travel up and back on the A127 every day twice a day.</p> <p>The Billericay schools are already full, there are many children still</p>	Your comments and concerns are noted. This is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities' standards for community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The South Essex Plan will be subject to its own consultation processes in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>doing the same thing, A PROMISE NEEDS TO BE MADE MY THE COUNCIL AND GOVERNMENT AND THE BUILDERS TO BUILD NEW SCHOOLS. I was watching Mr Boris Johnson on question time and he made a promise that no builders could build any homes without putting in the infrastructure necessary. Since living here we have noticed that our garden floods as soon as the weather gets bad, rain, snow all cause a build up of water at the back of our garden, also the fields at the bottom of our road of which a lot of the houses are being build is also flooded. The land in this area is all clay, the sewage pipes are not fit for purpose. We need a promise again that all these concerned are addressed, and a promise is made by all that building of too many houses will not make this worst. The land being used should stay as land for feeding the population, as people move away from eating meat, more land will be needed for fruit and veg. Our environment has to be protected. Mature trees must be saved. Where are all these people going to work? are they going to get jobs local? or are they all going to travel to London?</p> <p>The roads are already gridlocked, how are all the people going to get to work? the trains are already over used, better green transport must be provided at an affordable cost, that is not the case right now.</p> <p>It seems that our little town will be left to the mercy of the developers as the council will just walk away after selling of our town. they can not be trusted to watch the developers, the people of Billericay are hard working people, people who care about the environment, people who will care for each other, people who will not be walked over.</p> <p>If this very large number of houses are built the amount of people living in Billericay will be too much for the local area to cope with. Please take care to consider all the facts and as we all agree that housing is need it need to be in proportion to the local area. I believe that the adjoining areas are also having large amounts of housing built, the impact is going to be at a very high cost to us all.</p> <p>Please, please, please , help to make an informed decision and listen to</p>	<p>The Basildon Borough Revised Publication Local Plan Statement of Consultation March 2019 sets out how the Council carried out its consultation process on the Revised Publication Local Plan, and summarises the results of the consultation.</p> <p>A Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the preparation of the South Essex Plan.</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>the local people.</p> <p>If the council and builders do agree to do any of the above it needs to be put into a concrete document so that they cannot wiggle out of it</p>	
<b>Stoden Taylor</b>				
085	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		<p>Even with no new housing, the population of Billericay is increasing due to the expansion of existing housing. Every site that is redeveloped is rebuilt with increased floor area, in order to command a higher price. Yet there is insufficient 'affordable housing' for those working in Billericay, within walking or cycling distance of the High Street and local industrial estates.</p> <p>Road Transport and Infrastructure</p> <p>The 'executive' housing that developers want to build in Billericay usually results in two cars per household. Yet as a resident of The Vale, I know that the B1007 Stock Road is already saturated at rush hours, especially at junctions. Moreover, cycling is unsafe and reduces motorized traffic capacity, since overtaking is often blocked by opposing traffic. But there is no room to add cycle paths or even to increase the road width.</p> <p>Rail Transport and Infrastructure</p> <p>The 'executive' housing that developers want to build in Billericay usually results in two occupants going out to work to pay the mortgage, with one or both commuting by rail to London or elsewhere. Reaching Billericay rail station by bus is limited by bus and road capacities, and by parking space at the station. Reaching Ingatestone rail station by car from Billericay is limited by road capacity, including a narrow bridge, and by parking space at the station. The shortage of parking space at the stations results in increased car traffic to and from the stations in the morning and evening rush hours.</p> <p>I draw your attention to:</p>	<p>Your concerns are noted. This is considered to be outside the scope of the SCI Addendum, which is only intended to outline the joint authorities' standards for community involvement in the preparation of the South Essex Plan. The South Essex Plan will be subject to its own consultation processes in accordance with the relevant regulations.</p> <p>The Basildon Borough Revised Publication Local Plan Statement of Consultation March 2019 sets out how the Council carried out its consultation process on the Revised Publication Local Plan, and summarises the results of the consultation.</p> <p>A Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the preparation of the South Essex Plan.</p>

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			<p>- the already crowded state of trains in rush hours. For all those boarding at Billericay and Ingatestone, this means standing, which is less safe and more tiring.</p> <p>- the additional rail traffic from the expansion of Southend Airport. Moreover, these passengers invariably have considerable luggage. This means that trains from Billericay to London will be even more full, especially in the morning rush hour.</p> <p>- the additional rail traffic from the relocation of HMRC from Southend to Stratford (East). This means that trains from Billericay to London will be even more full, especially in the morning rush hour.</p> <p>- the additional rail traffic from the large new estates around Chelmsford and beyond. This means that trains from Ingatestone to London will be even more full, especially in the morning rush hour. Chelmsford has secured £218m funding for the new Chelmsford railway station in Beaulieu village (a huge development of over 2500 homes to the East of Chelmsford) and a new by pass road between the A12 and A131. This is to relieve the main Chelmsford railway station and local roads (<a href="https://www.essexhighways.org/highway-schemes-and-developments/highwayschemes/chelmsford-north-east-bypass.aspx">https://www.essexhighways.org/highway-schemes-and-developments/highwayschemes/chelmsford-north-east-bypass.aspx</a>) But the new railway station and road may not be completed until 2024/25. Yet the Army &amp; Navy flyover is closed and will be taken down. (<a href="https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-essex-49719678">https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-essex-49719678</a>). The scope for increased capacity on the rail lines from Billericay and Ingatestone, especially towards London, is exhausted. The number of rail tracks is limited to two (one up, one down) by the many bridges and cuttings. The train frequency is limited by safety and signalling considerations. The train length has been increased to 12 cars at peak hours, and there is no room for longer platforms. The train capacity is limited by the width and length of carriages, and new rolling stock only increases capacity slightly by having fewer seats with more standing.</p> <p>Conclusions More housing in Billericay would further overload the existing road and</p>	

Rep No	Section	Comment	Rep	Council Response
			rail transport infrastructure, and further reduce the quality of life for all existing residents and taxpayers. The planners should instead look elsewhere - notably to the North of England that has far lower population densities and great need of inward investment	
<b>NHS England (Ms Kerry Harding)</b>				
086	SCI Addendum for the South Essex Plan		Please see below our comments in relation to the South Essex Plan Statement of community Involvement Overall comment: As contained within the separate submission for the Thurrock CCG the Mid and South Essex Sustainability and Transformation Partnership (STP) welcomes a standardised approach across all South Essex Councils for Community Involvement.	Comment welcomed.
087	How we will consult		All Councils within Mid and South Essex are members of the Mid and South Essex STP Strategic Estates Forum. Representation at these meetings is critical to partnership working and building of relationships between health partners and local authorities. The STP aim to respond to all planning policy consultations jointly. Presentations should be provided by the relevant local authority/ies at the outset of each consultations to provide a clear understanding of the detail, intentions and implications of each document as part of a two way conversation to ensure robustness and sustainability.	Comments noted. The South Essex Authorities will seek to actively engage with the STP at all stages of Plan preparation.
<b>Port of London Authority (Michael Atkins)</b>				
088	When we will consult		I have now had the opportunity to review the revised draft SCI and can confirm that the PLA has no specific comments to make. As noted within the document the PLA request to be consulted at each stage of the development process for both the Thurrock Local Plan and the South Essex Plan and would encourage early engagement on matters relating to the River Thames, and the important role it plays in the borough and the wider South Essex region.	Noted.  The respondent to be included on the consultee database for the South Essex Plan and consulted at all public stages of the plan preparation.