

# Statement of Consultation Appendix – Part 7

## New Housing Development Sites Policies H7-H13

---

Summary of Comment	Summary Reference	Council Response	Council Action	Consultee Rep ID
Support the site allocation in H7.	H7.1	Support noted.	None required.	DLP/4216
Council should work proactively with landowner to bring forward development before 2020.	H7.2	As stated in criteria 2 of Policy Imp1, the Council is committed to working with developers to bring forward development proposals that are in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan.	None required.	DLP/4216
Support for allocation and policy approach, subject to some wording changes to improve flexibility (HCA).	H7.3	Support for policy noted. The wording amendments put forward by the HCA are reasonable as they would enable the delivery of the quantum of development proposed in draft policy H7 whilst providing flexibility over the use of land, depending on the quantum of open space uses secured in off-site locations.	Amend the wording of policy H7 to reflect the representation by the HCA, which maintains the overall quantum of development required but has some flexibilities around land use linked to open space relocation.	DLP/4218
Recognition of existing open space provision on site H7 welcomed.	H7.4	Noted.	None required	DLP/51
Gun club should be moved to improve development potential of site.	H7.5	The Council is giving consideration to how the sporting uses of this site can be best located/relocated in order to maximise the potential of the site.	None required	DLP/44
Support for inclusion of G&T provision in this site development mix.	H7.6	Support noted	None required	DLP/40, DLP/2847
Proximity of the site to the Mayflower Retail park negates the need for a shopping centre within the site.	H7.7	Proximity of the Mayflower Retail Park is noted. It should be noted that the Mayflower Retail Park is an out of town retail development, and the nearest convenience retail provision is located at the furthest part of that park from the site. There is therefore the need for a small local centre	None required	DLP/1876, DLP/4437

		within the site to provide local convenience retail provision, and to prevent some short journeys by car. The on-site shopping provision does not however need to be significant within the context of the site. Draft policy H7 requires the provision of a local centre only, indicating that the scale of on-site retail provision is not expected to be significant.		
Implications of relocating sports uses from Gardiners Lane on the viability of development at receptor sites should be assessed.	H7.8	It is agreed that there is a cost associated with the relocation of sports uses from Gardiners Lane that needs to be factored into the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment should be reviewed to consider this matter.	Review the Whole Plan Viability Assessment to ensure that the costs associated with the relocation of sports pitches from Gardiners Lane have been assessed. Consider approach to Gardiners Lane, and receptor sites in light of this assessment.	DLP/52, DLP/2018, DLP/3439, DLP/4218
Any relocated provision of open space should be of equal or better quantity and quality.	H7.9	It is agreed that any relocated provision should be of equal or better quantity and quality. This is consistent with the NPPF. The wording associated with policy H7 should be amended to make this clear.	Consider these matters, and amend policy H7 accordingly.	DLP/53
Additional provision of open space in terms of either quantity or quality should be secured to meet the needs of the additional development.	H7.10	It is agreed that the new development will generate a need for open space above that which is already on site. This need will be identified through the application of the Open Space Standards as required by policy HC1. The wording associated with policy H7 should be amended to make this clear.	Consider these matters, and amend policy H7 accordingly.	DLP/53
The quantum of open space required within this development should not be stated unless the	H7.11	It is recognised that there are unresolved issues associated with the approach to open space on this site. It is agreed that it may be appropriate to provide some	Consider these matters, and amend policy H7 accordingly.	DLP/53

matters associated with relocation are resolved.		flexibility within the wording to ensure that whatever approach is taken, open space provision does not reduce in terms of quantity and quality.		
The masterplan should set out a strategy for open space retention/relocation.	H7.12	It is agreed that the masterplan should set out an approach to open space. The associated wording of policy H7 should be amended to make this clear.	Consider these matters, and amend policy H7 accordingly.	DLP/53
Due to the number of landowners involved, the requirement for comprehensive development has frustrated development on this site. A flexible approach should therefore be permitted.	H7.13	The Council recognises the frustrations that have been faced in bringing forward this site for development. However, this site is complex, and requires a co-ordinated approach. An appropriate balance therefore needs to be struck for this site in terms of comprehensive development requirements and flexibility for individual land owners. Policy H7 should be reviewed in this regard, but should not lose sight of the need for coordination between different landowners and different proposals to ensure a sustainable pattern and form of development.	Review the requirements of policy H7 in terms of comprehensive development to determine whether any flexibility can be offered whilst still ensuring sustainable patterns and forms of development.	DLP/580, DLP/2337, DLP/3051
Potential archaeology at the SW corner of this site.	H7.14	Information related to the potential for archaeology on this site is noted. The Council will seek advice on this matter from the Historic Environment Service at Essex County Council, and should if necessary amend the wording associated with policy H7 to ensure cross referencing with policy HE4 - Schedule Monuments and Archaeology.	Seek advice from the Historic Environment Service at Essex County Council regarding potential for archaeology at site H7. If necessary, use the results of this investigation to ensure that the wording of H7 specifically cross references policy HE4.	DLP/1308
Drainage undertaker welcomes reference	H7.15	Support of policy wording in relation to drainage infrastructure noted	None required	DLP/4387

within policy H7 to the alignment of development with drainage infrastructure improvements.				
Concerned about the viability and/or deliverability of the mix of development identified in Draft Policy H7.	H7.16	Concern about the viability of the mix of development identified in policy H7 noted. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be reviewed in order to give further consideration to this matter. The mix of development in policy H7 may need to be amended as a consequence of this review.	Review the Whole Plan Viability Assessment to ensure that the proposals within policy H7 are viable and deliverable. If required consideration should be given to the mix of development proposed for policy H7 in order to improve viability and deliverability.	DLP/3437
The relocation of open spaces uses from H7 to H10/H13 is not justified.	H7.17	The Council is committed to making the best use of land within the urban area for residential development purposes, as it is these locations which are the most sustainable. Housing need alone does not constitute exceptional circumstances in itself for changing Green Belt boundaries, as set out in the PPG. It is the range of benefits that sites in the Green Belt can bring that provides exceptional circumstances. It is considered by the Council that the benefits that sites H10 and H13 can provide in enabling the development of the Gardiners Lane site, which sits in the heart of the urban area provides such exceptional circumstances to justify the wider release of these sites for residential development. The Council therefore considers its approach to this matter is justified.	None required.	DLP/2018, DLP/2022
Masterplans for site H7 should be informed by,	H7.18	It is recognised that this site is likely to comprise green infrastructure assets that can inform the layout of	Amend the wording associated with policy H7 to make clear that the masterplan should incorporate a	DLP/2238

and enhance green infrastructure on site.		development and be enhanced to provide further habitat for ecology and amenity for residents. It is agreed that the wording of policy H7 should be added to make this requirement clear.	consideration of Green Infrastructure.	
Buildings associated with relocated sports clubs will impact on the openness of the Green Belt, particularly if this was to occur around Barleylands.	H7.19	The Council has an OAN for housing which is bigger than the capacity of the urban area. By using the Gardiners Lane site to accommodate residential development, the impact on residential development on the Green Belt is reduced. It is considered that buildings associated with sports clubs will be less intrusive in the Green Belt than the residential development that will replace them. It is proposed that the replacement sports provision will be located to the east and west of Basildon and not at Barleylands.	None required	DLP/2542
Residential development of this site goes against the principals of the New Town which separated industrial development from residential.	H7.20	It is recognised that residential development on this site will sit amongst commercial development within the A127 corridor. The NPPF advocates the close location of residential and commercial development in order to reduce the need to travel. This national policy position departs from the policy applied in the development of the New Town, and reflects the passage of time in relation to planning policy. It should be noted that the Dunton Fields development, approved by the Council, sits within this corridor also. No changes to policy H7 are therefore recommended in relation to this representation.	None required	DLP/3362

<p>There should be a comprehensive approach to infrastructure provision for this site, also reflecting surrounding uses.</p>	<p>H7.21</p>	<p>Part 2 makes clear that the masterplan for this site should address infrastructure matters including highways infrastructure requirements. Whilst consideration of the surrounding area will be required in relation to this, it would be contrary to established planning law to expect infrastructure enhancements for this site to mitigate for other nearby developments. No amendment to policy H7 is therefore required in respect of this representation.</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>DLP/4437</p>
<p>Flexibility regarding the requirement to relocate the sports and recreational facilities is needed to enable early delivery.</p>	<p>H7.22</p>	<p>Whilst the Council would like to see early delivery on this site, it wishes to see the overall quantum and quality of sports facilities in the Borough retained or enhanced. Therefore, whilst consideration can be given to flexibility around this point, the overall outcome must achieve this. To do otherwise would be contrary to the NPPF.</p>	<p>Consider these matters, and amend policy H7 accordingly.</p>	<p>DLP/5445</p>
<p>Prefers options with higher quantum of residential development.</p>	<p>H7.23</p>	<p>It is noted that landowners/developers with an interest in this site would prefer higher quantum of residential development, as residential development attracts the highest land values. It should however be recognised that this site is located within the A127 Enterprise Corridor, and is surrounded by commercial development. There is an identified need for additional commercial floorspace within the borough, and this site therefore represents the most sustainable location for that</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>DLP/2337, DLP/4219</p>

		development. It is therefore appropriate that commercial development comprises a part of the mix of development on this site. The co-location of residential and commercial development on a site is advocated by the NPPF, and therefore the exclusion of commercial development on this site is not acceptable.		
Infrastructure requirements of policy are too prescriptive. Infrastructure requirements should be determined on a site by site basis at the time of application.	H7.24	A key concern for the Council is ensuring that new development is supported with sufficient infrastructure to ensure that it does not place undue pressure on existing facilities and services. The Local Plan sets out a plan covering a number of sites which may have cumulative impacts, beyond that which a site may have on its own. The requirements of the Local Plan and policy H7 reflect this broader consideration of infrastructure requirements and is therefore appropriate. It is not proposed that the infrastructure requirements of policy H7 are weakened in respect of this concern.	None required.	DLP/2337
The quantum of growth proposed at Gardiners Lane requires a 1fe primary school. This will increase to 1.5fe school if numbers increase to 1,100.	H7.25	Noted. It will be necessary to review the infrastructure requirements for policy H7 if a higher number of homes is delivered in this site.	Keep infrastructure requirements under review when considering alternative proposals for this site.	DLP/2609
The requirement for a masterplan or development brief to be prepared prior to the	H7.26	It is the Council's view that site H7 should form part of a high quality, mixed residential and employment neighbourhood, as is evident in part	None required.	DLP/2022

development of sites H7 and H10 is not justified.		from the planning decisions the local planning authority has already taken. This site is complex, and in order to realise the site's development potential in a comprehensive way and secure the relocation of existing recreational uses to bring forward the land for the alternative uses, a masterplan or development brief would be necessary to guide the site's delivery. The Council considers its approach to this matter is justified. Therefore, it remains the case that a masterplan is required for this site to ensure the efficient and effective use of land and the provision of sufficient infrastructure.		
Any presumption to grant planning applications for housing should be extended to Traveller site applications as well.	H7.27	Policy H7 states that Land west of Gardiners Lane South will be developed into a high quality mixed used community to provide at least 660 homes, a 15 pitch gypsy and traveller site, a local centre, open space and community facilities, in addition to policy requirements for B-class employment floorspace required by policy E5. Criterion 8 of the policy goes further to clarify that development on the sites should comply with all other relevant policy requirements of the plan. The development details of any planning application submitted to the Council will be expected to be in accordance with the strategic policies contained in the Local Plan. It is considered that the development of the site can be fully managed by the policies set	None required.	DLPQQ/485

		out in the Draft Local Plan without amendment.		
Improvements to A127 is required to deliver H7.	H7.28	Noted	None required.	DLP/4229
Phasing of sites should be provided and sites such as H7 which can be brought forward easier should be phased for delivery in the first five years.	H7.29	1. Phasing in the Draft Local Plan only related to allocations which required significant infrastructure works and which could not be brought forward until such works had been undertaken. Whilst the Council would like to see early delivery on site H7, it wishes to see the overall quantum and quality of sports facilities in the Borough retained or enhanced. Therefore, whilst consideration can be given to flexibility around delivery of H7, the overall outcome must achieve this. To do otherwise would be contrary to the NPPF. The next version of the Local Plan will set out the phasing of sites.	Consider these matters, and amend policy H7 accordingly.	DLP/4230
The entire area allocated as an Area of Special Reserve at Dry Street in the 1998 Local Plan should be removed from the Green Belt in the Draft Local Plan not just the area which was granted planning permission.	H8.1	The site allocation associated with H8 includes the land to which the comment relates.	None Required	DLP/1398
Object to the site allocation in policy H8.	H8.3	Objection noted.	None required	DLP/1290
A traveller site should be included in the	H8.4	This site already benefits from planning consent. This consent does	None required	DLP/148

requirements for site H8.		not include the requirement for a traveller site. It is not therefore realistic to expect the delivery of something which isn't within the scope of that existing planning consent on this site.		
Masterplans for site H8 should be informed by, and enhance green infrastructure on site.	H8.5	There is an extant planning consent for this site whereby environmental mitigation measures have already been agreed through the use of conditions and planning obligations. Amending this policy will not therefore result in any different outcomes in relation to this site.	None required	DLP/2239
Resist development due to ecological sensitivity.	H8.6	Objection noted. This site has planning consent, which included environmental mitigation agreed through the use of conditions and planning obligations.	None required	DLP/2548, DLP/20499,
Phase 1 did not achieve as high density as set out in the Outline Application. High densities should be achieved in further phases to reduce land loss.	H8.7	Concern about the density of development noted. The Council may wish to consider whether it wishes to include an indicative density for development on this site to guide further phases.	Consider whether it is appropriate to include an indicative development density in policy H8, and if so what that should be.	DLP/2548
Separate landowner has promoted land within this allocation for an additional 40 homes.	H8.8	The additional land available within this allocation is noted. The suitability of this land for development purposes will be assessed through the HELAA. If found to be suitable policy H8 will be amended accordingly to ensure that development of this part of the site, which does not benefit from planning consent at this time, makes appropriate proportionate contributions towards infrastructure	Review the land promoted through this representation, and if found to be suitable amend policy H8 accordingly to ensure that any additional development provides affordable housing, and also makes a proportionate contribution towards infrastructure.	DLP/1396

		and makes provision for affordable housing in line with policy H34.		
A s106 is already in place to deliver infrastructure on this site.	H8.9	Information noted.	None required.	DLP/2610
Support for allocation H9b.	H9.1	Support noted	None required	DLP/3363
Objection to allocation H9a.	H9.2	Objection noted.	None required	DLP/3363
Landowner of site H9a supports allocation, but seeks for a higher density development to be permitted.	H9.3	Support noted. Additional information has been submitted by this landowner advocating higher density development in this location, providing up to 50 homes. This information will be reviewed to determine whether an increased density will be appropriate in this location.	Consider the information submitted to determine whether higher density development should be permitted on this site. If considered appropriate amend policy H9 accordingly.	DLP/2353
Support for redevelopment of the former Basildon Zoo site in its entirety.	H9.4	Support for the redevelopment of the former Basildon Zoo site in its entirety noted. This is larger than the site identified in the draft Local Plan, and may have implications for the landscape and infrastructure capacity in this location. Therefore, further consideration will need to be given to this proposal against the range of evidence available in order to determine whether a larger development site in this location can be included in the Local Plan.	Review evidence to determine whether it is appropriate to allocate the whole of the former Basildon Zoo site for housing purposes in the Local Plan.	DLP/1923DLPQQ/217
Loss of Green Belt associated with this development.	H9.5	This site is largely previously developed. The NPPF and more recent Government pronouncements favour the development of previously	None required	DLP/2549

		developed land in the Green Belt over greenfield sites. Consequently, it is considered that the development of the site identified in policy H9 is appropriate.		
Proposes a larger scheme of c. 475 homes to the north of London Road with access from the London Road. A larger scale of development will contribute towards viability of local infrastructure improvements. Details of the proposal has been provided.	H9.6	Consideration was given to a larger scale of development to the north of the London Road in this location during the preparation of the Local Plan. Ecology and landscape impact concerns prevented the identification of a larger site. Consideration will be given as to whether the information set out in the detailed proposals provided to determine whether these issues can be overcome. This will be done in conjunction with the Council's ecology and landscape consultants where necessary. The outcomes of this review should be considered in determining the final extent of this site in the submission Local Plan.	Consider the detailed proposals put forward in relation to this larger site, and determine whether a larger site as proposed should be included in the Local Plan within this location.	DLP/2344
Due to proximity to Basildon meadows SSSI mitigation measures which secure carrying capacity of the SSSI should be required.	H9.7	The concerns of Natural England are noted. It is agreed that mitigation to the nearby SSSI should be secured, and that policy H8 should be amended accordingly to require this.	Amend policy H8 to require mitigation in respect of the nearby Basildon Meadows SSSI.	DLP/2734
Drainage undertaker welcomes reference within policy H9 to the alignment of development with drainage infrastructure improvements.	H9.8	Support of policy wording in relation to drainage infrastructure noted	None required	DLP/4407

Masterplan for site H9 should be informed by, and enhance green infrastructure on site.	H9.9	The current extent of sites h9a and H9b are such that a masterplanned approach is not appropriate. However, it should be noted that policy H9 does require compliance with policy NE5 specifically, which relates to biodiversity conservation and enhancement. However, if the Council were to give consideration to the proposal to allocate a larger area of land to the north of the London Road, then it would be appropriate for the policy to also be amended to require the consideration of green infrastructure assets and green infrastructure improvements in the design of the development.	None required unless a larger area of land is allocated to the north of the London Road. In such an instance a requirement should be introduced which seeks the consideration and enhancement of green infrastructure assets in the development proposal.	DLP/2240
The education needs of development at this scale on this site can be met within existing schools nearby.	H9.10	Information noted.	None required.	DLP/2612
Support for alternative land to be brought forward for development in this location	H9.11	Consideration will be given to the alternative land promoted in this representation.	Consider the potential for the alternative land put forward in this location for development purposes.	DLP/9605
Proximity of this site to wildlife interests requires care and mitigation	H9.12	The proximity of this site to wildlife interests is noted. The Ecology Site Survey report highlights further survey work and mitigation required to prevent harm.	None required.	DLP/20500,
Generally supportive of development in this location.	H10.1	Support noted.	None required	DLP/438, DLP/594, DLP/1056, DLP/1549, DLP/2731 DLP/3262, DLP/4962, DLP/4968, DLP/7319, DLP/7328, DLP/7329, DLP/7437, DLP/7443, DLP/7444, DLP/7447, DLP/7453, DLP/7454, DLP/7457, DLP/7463, DLP/7464, DLP/7467, DLP/7473, DLP/7474, DLP/8488

				DLP/8489, DLPQQ/113, DLPQQ/114, DLPQQ/864, DLPQQ/863
Cooperation / joint working between Basildon and Brentwood would achieve the best outcomes.	H10.2	The need for cooperation is recognised. However, as set out in the Draft Local Plan (alternative options), Brentwood Borough Council need to demonstrate that this is a good/most appropriate option for development within their borough. Basildon Council would need to be sure of this before committing to such a proposal in its own Local Plan, as otherwise the soundness of Basildon's plan would also be at risk. To date this has not occurred and Brentwood have pursued a course of action without engaging with Basildon. In order to achieve better outcomes, and to ensure that the legal and policy requirements associated with the Duty to Cooperate are fulfilled, Basildon Borough Council will be seeking to overcome this need for cooperation in the process of finalising the Local Plan.	Make efforts to engage Brentwood in considering cross boundary planning issues in order to achieve better planning outcomes and ensure the Duty to Cooperate is fulfilled.	DLP/438, DLP/1623, DLP/2787
Reference to Gypsy and Traveller provision in paragraph 11.89 is not reflected in policy requirements of policy H10.	H10.3	A decision was taken to not make provision for the need arising from the large unauthorised encampment that previously occupied the Dale Farm site. As a consequence of the overall requirement reducing, the need to secure new provision on large sites such as H10 diminished. This decision was taken later in the day, and whilst the requirement was removed from policy H10, the reference was not removed from the supporting text. Assuming the	If the Council's position regarding the provision of accommodation of gypsies and travellers remains unchanged, update paragraph 11.89 to remove cross reference to policy H3.	DLP/41

		Council's position in this regard removes unchanged, paragraph 11.89 will need amending to remove this requirement.		
Object to development proposals in Brentwood Draft Local Plan	H10.4	Objection noted.	None required	DLP/369, DLP/515, DLP/634, DLP/641, DLP/1524, DLP/2282, DLP/2436, DLP/20257DLPQQ/168, DLPQQ/988
Object to this allocation due to loss of Green Belt.	H10.5	Objection noted. However, in order to meet the OAN for housing, as set out in policy SD1, it is necessary to approximately 8,500 homes to be provided in the Green Belt. Impact on the Green Belt has been minimised by identifying all reasonable sources of urban land supply. The selection of sites within the Green Belt for development has been informed by the Green Belt Assessment 2015, and the associated addendum to that document which considers the implications of development on potential development sites on the ongoing purpose and function of the Green Belt. Development adjacent to the west of Basildon would leave a substantial swathe of land to the west between Basildon and West Horndon, and therefore in the absence of evidence from Brentwood that they intended to pursue development in this gap when engaged on an early draft of the Draft Local Plan (engagement in November 2015), the Council was of the view that the Green Belt would continue to function in this location. However, it is recognised that the	Undertake further engagement with Brentwood Borough to determine a shared approach to the Green Belt which best preserves the strategic gap between Basildon and West Horndon.	DLP/3, DLP/26, DLP/172, DLP/260, DLP/262, DLP/266, DLP/368, DLP/369, DLP/634, DLP/641, DLP/746, DLP/823, DLP/842, DLP/1027, DLP/1121, DLP/1352, DLP/1524, DLP/1741, DLP/1838, DLP/1885, DLP/2076, DLP/2214, DLP/2282, DLP/2436, DLP/3364, DLP/5786, DLP/5873, DLP/7289, DLP/7307, DLP/7482, DLP/7492, DLP/7502, DLP/7511, DLP/7521, DLP/7531, DLP/7541, DLP/7551, DLP/7561, DLP/7571, DLP/7581, DLP/7591, DLP/7601, DLP/7612, DLP/8627, DLP/9873, DLP/14315, DLP/18286, DLP/18348, DLP/18429, DLP/18444, DLP/18501, DLP/18543, DLP/18555, DLP/18574, DLP/18592, DLP/18607, DLP/18625, DLP/18653, DLP/18672, DLP/18686, DLP/18702, DLP/18721, DLP/18740, DLP/18762, DLP/18774, DLP/18797, DLP/18827, DLP/18842, DLP/18853, DLP/18863, DLP/18873, DLP/18889, DLP/18914, DLP/18935, DLP/18970, DLP/18988, DLP/19006, DLP/19025, DLP/19046, DLP/19067, DLP/19090, DLP/19113, DLP/19130, DLP/19150, DLP/19166, DLP/19184, DLP/19201, DLP/19214, DLP/19235, DLP/19247, DLP/19268, DLP/19286, DLP/19299, DLP/19313,

		<p>proposals in the Brentwood Draft Local Plan do now put that strategic gap in jeopardy, due to the proposal for the placement of the <i>Dunton Hills Garden Village</i> in the middle of the strategic gap. This proposal is not justified by evidence, and would be harmful to the strategic gap in its own right as well as in combination with any development that were to occur to the West of Basildon or around West Hordon. Basildon Borough Council has therefore objected strongly to this proposal. However, this objection alone is unlikely to resolve this Green Belt issue, and therefore there is a need for Basildon Council to engage with Brentwood to determine the best approach to ensuring the strategic gap in this location is maintained through the sensible placement of development. It should be noted that alternative sites in Brentwood Borough around West Hordon have been promoted which may better preserve the strategic gap compared to the village proposed in their Draft Local Plan.</p>		<p>DLP/20155, DLP/20178, DLP/20478, DLPSA/1, DLPSA/8DLPQQ/52, DLPQQ/53, DLPQQ/153, DLPQQ/156, DLPQQ/238, DLPQQ/695, DLPQQ/447, DLPQQ/406, DLPQQ/468, DLPQQ/479, DLPQQ/273, DLPQQ/390, DLPQQ/749, DLPQQ/623</p>
<p>Consideration has not been given to urban capacity in identifying site H10 for development.</p>	H10.6	<p>As set out in policy SD1 up to 7,000 homes are identified to be secured in the existing urban area, representing the capacity of the urban area to accommodate growth.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLP/5068</p>
<p>The proposal for a secondary school linked to site H10 should not be delayed until later in the plan period as it</p>	H10.7	<p>Essex County Council, as the authority responsible for planning for education provision, were engaged in the preparation of the Draft Local Plan. They advised that the quantum</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLP/646, DLP/842, DLP/822, DLP/3011, DLP/3184, DLP/824, DLP/14315, DLPQQ/468, DLPQQ/479, DLPQQ/930</p>

would benefit the community now.		of growth proposed for the Basildon Urban Area would potentially require a new secondary school beyond 2025, however the exact timing of need would be determined by a) the rate of housing delivery; and b) the age of people living in the Borough. Policy H10, as currently worded, allows for the school to be provided earlier than 2034 if required, although it is not identified as an immediate requirement based on the evidence of need.		
Concern about impact of development on the character of the village and amenity of villagers.	H10.8	It is recognised that development in this location will change the nature of the settlement of Dunton. Whilst a degree of mitigation of the effects of this can be achieved through the way new development is laid out, accessed and landscape, it is a consequence of this plan which needs to be given consideration. It should however be noted that there are likely to be residents affected by all of the development proposals in the Local Plan, and therefore any approach taken in considering such consequences needs to be balanced and evidence based.	Consider the consequences of the proposals on the settlement of Dunton and residential amenity of residents in this location. Consider 1) opportunities for mitigation; and 2) Evidence based approach to considering impacts. An approach which is inconsistently applied would fail at examination.	DLP/9, DLP/368, DLP/634, DLP/657, DLP/842, DLP/2866, DLP/5786, DLP/5873, DLP/18493DLPQQ/738
Development near park home site will cause particular disturbance to the residents there, as mobile homes are not well insulated.	H10.9	It is noted that the mobile homes may experience increased disturbance due to the extent of their insulation. It is however considered that such disturbance can be mitigated through the appropriate separation of development and use of landscaping.	Amend policy H10 to require development separation and landscape buffering between any proposed development and the park home site.	DLP/657

Land within H10b is available and should be brought forward for development during plan period.	H10.10	It is noted that additional land has been promoted within the area identified as site H10b in the Draft Local Plan. The deliverability/developability of this land will be assessed through the HELAA Review 2016, and this assessment will be used to inform the final suite of sites identified in the Submission Local Plan. It should however be noted that this land is located within the Green Belt, and therefore its availability does not necessarily guarantee its inclusion as a balanced decision will need to be taken on the desirability of identifying additional land in this location.	Consider the outcomes of the HELAA in relation to the availability of deliverable/developable sites in determining the final extent of housing allocations in the Draft Local Plan.	DLP/2073, DLP/2735, DLP/2751, DLP/2774, DLP/4961, DLP/3004, DLP/5D4,
Letter to Brentwood objecting to their Local Plan, in particular Dunton Hills Garden Village proposal, provided for information purposes.	H10.11	Information noted.	None required.	DLP/694, DLP/696
A secondary school will be required to support growth arising in Basildon beyond 2024.	H10.12	Noted. This requirement is set out in policy H10.	None required.	DLP/2609, DLP/2610, DLP/2612, DLP/2613, DLP/2614, DLP/2616, DLP/2617
A 1.5 - 2fe primary school may be required to meet the need arising during the plan-period.	H10.13	Information noted. Amend policy H10 to reflect this plan period requirement.	Amend policy H10 to reflect the requirement for a 1.5fe to 2 fe primary school during the plan period.	DLP/2613
A secondary school may better be provided within Dunton Hills Garden Village.	H10.14	It is noted that Brentwood are proposing a Dunton Hills Garden Village, which would also give rise to secondary education needs if it were to go ahead. Whilst Basildon Borough Council agrees with the	None required at this time, although ongoing review of the position in Brentwood is advised.	DLP/2613

		principle of cross-boundary collaboration on such matters, it does not consider that the Dunton Hills Garden Village has been justified by evidence. Basildon Borough Council would not therefore be comfortable at this time on relying on infrastructure provision, required to meet the needs of Basildon borough, in a proposal which cannot be justified in planning terms and is not supported by evidence.		
Any relocated sports facilities should be secured as part of site H10a.	H10.15	Noted that relocated sports facilities must be secured on land available for development during the plan period. The wording of policy H10 will be amended to make this clear.	Amend the wording of policy H10 to provide clarity around the requirements for open space provision on this site.	DLP/54
Additional sport provision, over that which is relocated must be made to accommodate needs of growth from site itself.	H10.16	Noted. The wording of policy H10 will be amended to make this clear.	Amend the wording of policy H10 to provide clarity around the requirements for open space provision on this site.	DLP/54
Sport provision should be included within the requirements for masterplanning.	H10.17	Noted. The wording of policy H10 will be amended to make this clear.	Amend the wording of policy H10 to provide clarity around the requirements for open space provision on this site.	DLP/54
Seeks for landscape buffers to incorporate multi-user rights of way.	H10.18	It is agreed that a multi-user right of way could be incorporated within elements of the landscape buffering for this site. Policy H10 will be amended accordingly to include this requirement where practical.	Amend policy H10 accordingly to include reference to multi-user rights of way.	DLP/218, DLP/1434
Seeks for multi user crossings to be provided over the A127 and railway line to improve permeability for non-motorised travel.	H10.19	The need for improved permeability for non-motorised travel is noted. This matter will be raised with the County Council as the highway authority to determine whether such crossing proposals are viable.	Discuss with the County Council the possibility on crossings for the A127 and railway line. Amend the Local Plan if appropriate.	DLP/218, DLP/368 DLP/1434,DLPQQ/406

<p>Seeks to provide a energy plant burning waste products on land within the site allocated H10 due to its proximity to a) Dunton Garden Suburb and b) the NG high pressure gas main in this location.</p>	<p>H10.20</p>	<p>The Council will give consideration to these proposals, but has concerns about the proximity of a waste burning facility in close proximity to existing development in Laindon, let alone the proposed residential development in this location. There are also concerns about the potential scale of facility proposed and its impact on landscape and transport infrastructure which would need to be addressed fully. In terms of the justification for this proposal in this location, the Council is not pursuing Dunton Garden Suburb, and therefore the housing anticipated to pay for the energy from this facility will not be present. Indeed, this is a location within the Borough where energy generation from waste is likely to require movement of materials by vehicle, and not necessarily aligned with the energy needs of the area. A proposal has been developed for the Burnt Mills Industrial Estate which would see waste management align better with energy production and energy usage requirements, and presents a potentially more sustainable alternative approach to moving to a low carbon economy.</p>	<p>Review the information submitted in relation to this proposal, and consider whether it is the most appropriate means of moving towards a low carbon economy for Basildon Borough - include a review within the SA/SEA.</p>	<p>DLP/577, DLP/14315,</p>
<p>Make reference to the potential for non-designated historic assets to be present in this location.</p>	<p>H10.21</p>	<p>It is noted that non-designated historic assets may be present in this location, requiring a desk top study to be undertaken as part of any planning application in accordance with NPPF and PPG. Policy H10 will be amended to include this.</p>	<p>Amend policy H10 to also require consideration of non-designated historic assets in accordance with the historic environment chapter of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>DLP/715, DLP/5786, DLP/9873,</p>

<p>Object to development in this location due to the loss of a wildlife corridor between Thorndon Park and Langdon Hills. At a minimum GI should be incorporated into the masterplan for the site.</p>	<p>H10.22</p>	<p>Objection noted. However, there are no nature conservation designations within this site, and the ecology assessments undertaken did not show any significant wildlife constraints in this location. The NPPF is clear that the significance of wildlife designations should be considered when determining the acceptability of development, and in this case the significance is not high. That being said, the NPPF does expect local authorities to seek benefits for biodiversity, and for a strategic approach to be taken to GI. The incorporation of GI within the masterplan for this site is therefore appropriate and policy H10 will be amended accordingly to require this.</p>	<p>Amend policy H10 to require GI provision within the masterplan for the site.</p>	<p>DLP/1524, DLP/2241, DLP/10002, DLP/9835,</p>
<p>Objection to Dunton Garden Suburb proposal (alternative option)</p>	<p>H10.23</p>	<p>Objection noted. Dunton Garden Suburb was a potential cross-boundary development in conjunction with Brentwood Borough Council which was subject to a joint public consultation in 2015. A summary report of the consultation comments was published in December 2015. The Council considered the option to secure this cross-boundary development, however this option was discounted in the absence of appropriate evidence from Brentwood, as it is not known if the proposal is the most appropriate option for their area.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLP2, DLP/13, DLP/14, DLP/172, DLP/1023, DLP/1027, DLP/1121, DLP/1352, DLP/1741, DLP/1885, DLP/1946, DLP/2020, DLP/2153, DLP/2342, DLP/3011, DLP/3339, DLP/3364, DLP/3365, DLP/9835, DLP/20105, DLP/517 DLPQQ/8, DLPQQ/12, DLPQQ/32, DLPQQ/33, DLPQQ/91, DLPQQ/174, DLPQQ/182, DLPQQ/544, DLPQQ/997, DLPQQ/242, DLPQQ/936, DLPQQ/325, DLPQQ/926, DLPQQ/918, DLPQQ/546, DLPQQ/709, DLPQQ/939, DLPQQ/716, DLPQQ/727</p>

<p>Promoter of land in West Horndon objects to site H10, and considers that Basildon Council in considering Dunton Garden Suburb has failed to fulfil the Duty to Cooperate.</p>	<p>H10.24</p>	<p>It is noted that a developer promoting Green Belt land in West Horndon could feel threatened by development to the West of Basildon as the strategic gap between the two settlements will come under threat from both sides. However, the sites identified in the Draft Local Plan have been informed by a robust evidence base including Green Belt Assessment and Landscape Assessment. Sites in Brentwood have not been subject to the same level of appraisal, and consequently Basildon Borough Council cannot comment on the relative merits of sites in that Borough. Additionally, as a consequent of the lack of appraisal work in Brentwood, Basildon is unable to support the allocation of a Dunton Hills Garden Suburb, as was set out in the Draft Local Plan. This has been made clear to Brentwood, who are responsible for planning in their area - Basildon cannot make Brentwood rectify this position. Basildon have been effective in communicating their concerns to Brentwood, and are therefore confident that reasonable measures have been taken to fulfil the Duty to Cooperate from the Basildon perspective.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLP/2129, DLP/2342</p>
<p>Conflicts between allocations in Brentwood Draft Local Plan and Basildon Draft Local Plan present challenges in terms of</p>	<p>H10.25</p>	<p>Basildon Council presented the proposals in the Draft Local Plan to other local authorities, including Brentwood, in November 2015. No mention of the proposals emerging in Brentwood Borough were brought to</p>	<p>Undertake additional engagement with Brentwood Borough to address strategic planning issues.</p>	<p>DLP/4681, DLP/4660</p>

strategic planning, and a soundness issue in relation to the Duty to Cooperate.		the attention of Basildon Council at that time, resulting in the conflict being unaddressed in the Draft Local Plan. Efforts will be taken to address some of these issues in the submission Local Plan, however at this time Basildon Council remains unconvinced by Brentwood's Local Plan due to the lack of evidence supporting the allocations proposed.		
Developer with land interests in site H10 supports the allocation in policy H10.	H10.26	Support noted.	None required.	DLP/2021, DLP/3004
The scale of development proposed in this location requires consideration to be given to the landscape on a wider scale, as it will have impact on long-distance views in South Essex.	H10.27	The Council has had a considerable amount of landscape evidence prepared in order to inform the identification of development sites in the Draft Local Plan. An initial Landscape Character Assessment has been followed by site specific Outline Landscape Appraisals in order to identify locations and specific development areas. However, it is recognised that this proposal is of a significant scale, and therefore the matters raised in this representation will be appraised by the Council's landscape consultants to ensure that wider scale issues have been fully considered.	Seek advice on the wider scale landscape issues raised to ensure that the impacts of any proposals in this location on the wider South Essex landscape are minimised.	DLP/2076, DLP/2550, DLP/5786
The deliverability of this site has not been demonstrated.	H10.28	Sites identified in the Draft Local Plan were informed by the HELAA, with only Suitable, Available and Achievable sites identified for inclusion. Site H10a has developers in place over the majority of its area, able to deliver a minimum of the 1,000 homes set out in policy H10	Introduce phasing into the submission Local Plan, having regard to discussions with ECC on infrastructure requirements.	DLP/2076, DLP/2153, DLP/2342

		<p>for delivery in the plan period. The representations received from those developers to this consultation have indicated that the provision of the education and transport improvements sought are deliverable. That being said, it is recognised that development in this location will also impact on strategic infrastructure such as the A127. Therefore, the Council is liaising with Essex County Council, as the Highway authority, to understand their representations in relation to this strategic piece of infrastructure and any phasing of development that is required to support improvements to this route. This phasing will be included within the submission Local Plan.</p>		
<p>The SATURN model for Basildon does not extend to the Lower Dunton Road, and therefore the impacts of this development on the Lower Dunton Road and wider network to the west are unknown.</p>	H10.29	<p>Noted. The Council is working with Essex County Council and Essex Highways to prepared a VISUM model for the Borough which will seek to address the issues with the extent of the SATURN model, and also the overlaps between the SATURN model and the Spreadsheet models for Billericay and Wickford. This will provide a more complete, up to date, picture of highways impacts, and allow for any additional mitigation requirements to be identified.</p>	<p>Use updated VISUM model and associated modelling and mitigation report to amend the highways requirements associated with site H10 accordingly.</p>	DLP/2076
<p>Cumulative impact of development at West Basildon and in Brentwood will have</p>	H10.30	<p>Noted. The Council is working with Essex County Council and Essex Highways to prepared a VISUM model for the Borough which will better deal with the cumulative</p>	<p>Use VISUM model, A127 Corridor for Growth Strategy and phasing discussions to update the highway requirements associated with site</p>	DLP/1741, DLP/1885, DLP/2076

<p>consequences for the A127 to the west.</p>		<p>impacts of development in Basildon Borough, and also with the cumulative impacts of development across boundaries. In addition to this, the Council is working with ECC on a review of the A127 Corridor for Growth Strategy, and on looking at phasing of development to align with improvements to the A127. This phasing will be reflected in the submission Local Plan.</p>	<p>H10 accordingly, including any phasing requirements.</p>	
<p>Developer with land interests in allocation H10a objects to the requirement of a masterplanned approach to this site, and seeks for piecemeal development to be permitted. This developer is concerned that the scale of infrastructure requirements for this allocation are not met by his site alone.</p>	<p>H10.31</p>	<p>This land is currently within the extent of the Green Belt, and it is for the Council to decide where and how new development sites are brought forward to meet the needs of the area. It is considered that a large scale development to the west of Basildon may represent a suitable development location, however it is expected that this will require infrastructure improvements and planning in order to deliver sustainable patterns of development that are supported by sufficient infrastructure and services to support sustainable communities and prevent capacity issues for existing infrastructure. A masterplanned approach is therefore appropriate in order to ensure that all of the necessary infrastructure is delivered, and the Council is not inclined to depart from this position. Landowners/developers are encouraged to work together to prepare such a masterplan which ensures a fair distribution of infrastructure provision across the</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLP/2019, DLP/2073, DLP/2769</p>

		site. If landowners/developers are unwilling to do this, they will have to wait for the Council to undertake such a task.		
The SATURN model is out of date and does not include recent data reflecting changes to the strategic road network. Modelling undertaken for Dunton Fields shows there is less capacity at the Dunton Junction than assumed in the SATURN model.	H10.32	The Council is working with Essex County Council and Essex Highways to prepared a VISUM model for the Borough which will seek to address the issues with the extent of the SATURN model. This will also capture updated data for the strategic road network and new data regarding the cumulative impacts of development across boundaries. This will be used to identify the need for any additional mitigation, including if ant is necessary around the Dunton junction.	Use updated VISUM model and associated modelling and mitigation report to amend the highways requirements associated with site H10 accordingly.	DLP/2153, DLP/2342
Development in this location is not supported by the SA which shows the potential for environmental harm.	H10.33	The SA shows the potential for environmental harm across many of the Green Belt locations identified in the Draft Local Plan, as is likely to be the case with Greenfield Sites. It is not considered that the environmental harm at this site is any greater than that on similarly allocated sites, and there are no ecological or landscape designation that will be affected by development in this location. Overall, the SA finds that when environmental, social and economic factors are considered in the whole development in this location is appropriate.	None required.	Delph/2153, DLP/2342, DLP/5786
Support for higher density development on	H10.34	Support for higher density development noted. Consideration will be given to the desirability of this	Consider whether higher development densities in this location would be suitable, and if	DLP/2073, DLP/2550, DLP/2769

<p>this site to make more efficient use of land.</p>		<p>option in light of the evidence available to determine if higher density development in this location would be suitable.</p>	<p>appropriate amend policy H10 of the Local Plan accordingly.</p>	
<p>Developer has undertaken highway modelling work showing an alternative to the link road identified in the mitigation modelling which would provide suitable access for cars, buses and cyclists.</p>	H10.35	<p>Noted. The information provided will be reviewed by ECC and Essex Highways to determine whether the benefits offered by the developers highway proposals are as good as those offered by the Council's mitigation proposal. If appropriate, H10 should be amended to reflect this alternative highway proposal.</p>	<p>Seek the views of ECC and Essex Highways on the proposals for site access put forward by the developer. If benefits are equal or better than the Council's mitigation proposal amend H10 accordingly.</p>	DLP/2073, DLP/2769
<p>Developer is of the view that the site is viable, although this is subject to the implications of other policy requirements</p>	H10.36	<p>Noted. The information provided by the developer in this regard will be sent to the Council's viability consultants for consideration.</p>	<p>Seek the views of the Council's viability consultants on the viability of the development proposals for site H10 in light of the additional information provided by the potential developer.</p>	DLP/2073, Delph/2769
<p>Developer objects to the requirement to secure employment provision as part of policy H10.</p>	H10.37	<p>Objection noted. The Council's ELPS reviewed potential locations for additional employment provision to meet the requirements for the growth in employment over the plan period. This location scored fair in that assessment due to its proximity to infrastructure and existing employment provision in the A127 corridor. It should be noted that only greenfield locations to the east and west of the A127 corridor score positively at all. The land is currently within the extent of the Green Belt, and is not available for development at all at this time. It is considered that land in this location could make provision for both residential purposes and also a quantum of employment growth, and the Council</p>	<p>None required.</p>	DLP/2073

		intends to pursue this position given that housing growth needs to be accompanied by employment growth in order to create sustainable development patterns. The Council is not therefore inclined to remove the employment requirement from this site, and expects the full requirement to be met within the allocated area through a process of masterplanning.		
Developer objects to the requirement to make provision for relocated sports facilities from Gardiners Lane within this allocation.	H10.38	Objection noted. The purpose of the Local Plan is to meet the Borough's development needs, and there is a need for open space provision at Gardiners Lane to be relocated in order for those development needs to be met through the provision of housing in the heart of the urban area in the most sustainable development location. It is expected that this open space provision will be located on the edge of the urban areas close to the resident population, ensuring their ongoing accessibility. Generally, such development could occur in the Green Belt without the need to amend Green Belt boundaries as it represents a positive use, as set out in the NPPF. However, in order to assist in facilitating such relocation of sports facilities, the Council has given consideration to permitting residential and employment development in these locations also, amending the Green Belt boundaries. It is considered that the need for relocation of sports facilities	Amend IDP to make clear that relocation of sports facilities from Gardiners Lane needs to be funded from either Gardiners Lane development itself, or from CIL, with match funding from sports infrastructure bodies where available.	DLP/2073, DLP/2769

		is a wider benefit offered by site H10, which would be diminished if not provided, and would bring into question the suitability of development in this location, particularly given some of the other concerns noted by consultees. The Council is not therefore inclined to remove this requirement, but will recognise through the IDP that funding will be required to deliver those elements of sporting infrastructure not related to growth specifically arising from the development of this site.		
Clarity is required regarding how infrastructure will be funded.	H10.39	Noted. The IDP will be updated to reflect ongoing discussions in relation to this matter.	Amend IDP to reflect ongoing discussions regarding how different pieces of infrastructure will be funded.	DLP/369, DLP/634, DLP/641, DLP/2073, DLP/2769, DLP/4810
Support for the relocation of sports clubs from Gardiners Lane South in this location, although concerned about the phasing of development to enable this	H10.40	Support for the relocation of sport pitches from Gardiners Lane South to this site is noted. Policy H10 requires the preparation of a Masterplan which will identify how sports pitches will be accommodated on this site. This would allow the developers of Gardiners Lane South to identify how best to bring forward replacement sports provision in this location ahead of development occurring if necessary.	None required	DLP/4220
Concerns about impact of development on this site on the landscape / rural character of the area.	H10.41	It is recognised that development in this location will change the appearance of the area. The Council has sought to identify those locations where the impact on landscape character will be reduced/least significant. Outline Landscape Appraisals were prepared for all	None required.	DLP/260, DLP/262, DLP/368, DLP/1524, DLP/2436, DLP/3801, DLP/5786, DLP/20501, DLPQQ/153, DLPQQ/303, DLPQQ/447

		potential strategic sites in order to identify where there may be capacity within the landscape for development to occur. Those sites located to the west of Basildon were identified using this landscape evidence, and are considered to be the most appropriate development locations in landscape terms.		
Concerns about impact of development on this site on wildlife.	H10.42	All potential strategic sites were subject to Ecology Appraisals to ensure that they would not have a significant impact on wildlife if brought forward for development. These appraisals were used to identify the extent of the development locations, and also to identify any mitigation required within the respective site allocation policies. This allocation is therefore appropriate in relation to wildlife impacts.	None required.	DLP/369, DLP/1027, DLP/1524, DLP/3801, DLP/368, DLP/9, DLP/2, DLP/172, DLP/14315, DLP/20501, DLPSA/1DLPQQ/76, DLPQQ/238, DLPQQ/406, DLPQQ/738
Concerns about flood risk arising from site H10.	H10.43	The proposed allocations in the Draft Local Plan have been subject to a flood risk sequential test, and found to be sequentially appropriate. That being said, it is recognised that areas of the borough are susceptible to surface water flood risk. Consequently, policy H20 requires consideration of flood risk matters in the development of the site, with compliance with policy CC4 required.	None required.	DLP/260, DLP/262, DLP/369, DLP/1121, DLP/1503, DLP/1587, DLP/2787, DLP/3801, DLP/4810, DLP/5786, DLP/368, DLP/823, DLP/14315, DLP/9835, DLPQQ/52, DLPQQ/53, DLPQQ/153, DLPQQ/154, DLPQQ/238, DLPQQ/239, DLPQQ/459, DLPQQ/359, DLPQQ/447, DLPQQ/468, DLPQQ/738, DLPQQ/767
Concern about infrastructure impacts arising from policy H10.	H10.44	Additional infrastructure is proposed as part of this plan, as set out in chapters 9 and 13. Policy IMP1 expects the delivery of new infrastructure alongside the delivery of housing and other forms of	Consider the implications of additional work around site access and local junctions, and add to policy requirements accordingly.	DLP/2, DLP/3, DLP/8, DLP/13, DLP/14, DLP/172, DLP/242, DLP/260, DLP/262, DLP/368, DLP/369, DLP/515, DLP/634, DLP/641, DLP/823, DLP/827, DLP/1027, DLP/1121, DLP/1503, DLP/1524,

		development and there are specific requirements in policy H10 in this regard. However, it is recognised that there will be localised infrastructure impacts, and additional work is therefore being undertaken around site access and local junctions in particular. This will be used to enhance the policy requirements for sites as appropriate.		DLP/1589, DLP/1838, DLP/1987, DLP/2282, DLP/2322 DLP/2436, DLP/2787, DLP/2866, DLP/3184, DLP/3801, DLP/4810, DLP/5786, DLP/9835, DLP/10326 DLP/14315, DLP/20155, DLP/20178, DLP/20263 DLP/29253, DLP/20253, DLP/20263, DLP/2322, DLP/10326 DLPSA/1, DLPSA/8, DLPQQ/390DLPQQ/9, DLPQQ/52, DLPQQ/153, DLPQQ/156, DLPQQ/168, DLPQQ/239, DLPQQ/303, DLPQQ/359, DLPQQ/406, DLPQQ/468, DLPQQ/479, DLPQQ/738
There is a gas pipeline running through the site which should not be built on or near.	H10.45	The presence of the Gas pipeline was identified in the supporting text to draft policy H10. There are rules around development within the proximity of a gas pipeline as set out by the HSE. Development must not occur on top of such a pipeline, and a buffer of land should be left either side to minimise risk to property and enable access by the gas undertaker. The gas pipeline runs close to the western boundary of the proposed allocation, and it is considered reasonable that the HSE rules in relation to development within the proximity of this pipeline can be integrated into a development scheme for this site. The HSE were consulted on the Draft Local Plan but have not issued a response. The HSE will be re-consulted on this matter to ensure that the rule in relation to this pipeline have been correctly interpreted.	Re-consult the HSE in relation to the pipeline in allocation H10 to ensure that the rules have been correctly interpreted.	DLP/368, DLP/2436, DLP/2787, DLP/5786, DLP/7283, DLP/7302, DLP/7490, DLP/7500, DLP/7509, DLP/7519, DLP/7529, DLP/7539, DLP/7549, DLP/7559, DLP/7569, DLP/7579, DLP/7589, DLP/7599, DLP/7609, DLP/7620, DLP/8047, DLP/9835, DLP/18321, DLP/18373, DLP/18442, DLP/18457, DLP/18499, DLP/18513, DLP/18531, DLP/18549, DLP/18570, DLP/18583, DLP/18605, DLP/18619, DLP/18641, DLP/18666, DLP/18684, DLP/18699, DLP/18719, DLP/18738, DLP/18753, DLP/18770, DLP/18790, DLP/18817, DLP/18838, DLP/18850, DLP/18861, DLP/18871, DLP/18883, DLP/18905, DLP/18929, DLP/18953, DLP/18985, DLP/19004, DLP/19020, DLP/19022, DLP/19036, DLP/19061, DLP/19082, DLP/19105, DLP/19123, DLP/19143, DLP/19164, DLP/19174, DLP/19195, DLP/19209, DLP/19229, DLP/19245, DLP/19265, DLP/19280, DLP/19297, DLP/19309,

				DLP/19326, DLP/20486, DLP/20579, DLP/20583, DLP/20297, DLPQQ/200, DLPQQ/239, DLPQQ/459
Development in this location will give rise to additional air quality issues.	H10.46	It is noted that there are concerns about air quality which have not been addressed through the Local Plan. Additional data will be collected in regard to Air Quality which will be used to inform the submission Local Plan.	Undertake additional air quality monitoring work, and use this to inform the allocations and any policy requirements in the submission Local Plan.	DLP172, DLP/369, DLP/634, DLP/641, DLP/823, DLP/1121, DLP/1352, DLP/1838, DLP/2787, DLP/5786, DLP/20297DLPQQ/468
A lower quantum of development may be appropriate in this area	H10.47	Support for a lower quantum of housing noted. Consideration will be given to this proposal, however it should be noted that this may have implications for the delivery of desired infrastructure such as a secondary school and/or replacement sports facilities for those being lost at Gardiners Lane.	Consider a lower level of provision at this site, having regard to the HELAA and the availability of land in alternative locations.	DLP/3011, DLP/14290,
Objection to the provision of commercial development as part of the development mix - commercial development is not required to meet the needs of local people, and it is not clear who would invest in Basildon.	H10.48	Objection noted. The Employment Land and Premise Study highlights the need for 49ha of additional employment land to meet the needs of economic growth within Basildon. Recent economic projections (see SHMA 2016) show that the economy is expected to grow and provide around 11,000 jobs over a 20 year period, aligning with the level of housing growth set out in the Draft Local Plan. Many jobs in Basildon are taken up by people living within Basildon or in the surrounding boroughs and districts. By providing job opportunities close to where people live there is the opportunity to reduce longer distance commuting	None required	DLP/641

		<p>and encourage local spending. There is also the opportunity to be engage more deprived communities, such as those which can be found in Basildon Town, in economic activity. There is therefore a distinct benefit to local people in providing local jobs. In terms of the nature of businesses such land will attract, this will evolve over time. The NPPF requires a flexible supply of employment land to enable enterprise. It should however be noted that Basildon has recently attracted significant investment from companies such as Costa and Amazon, indicating that Basildon is a place where employers will invest.</p>		
Provision of sports pitches in this location is an appropriate use of the Green Belt	H10.49	Noted. It is agreed that the placement of sports pitches in the Green Belt is a positive use, as defined in the NPPF.	None required	DLP/3364
Concern about the loss of agricultural land.	H10.50	It is noted that some of the site proposed in policy H10 is currently used for agricultural purposes. It is however being promoted for development by the landowner, and therefore it is not necessarily the intention of the landowner to continue with his agricultural practice in the future. The NPPF requires the highest level of protection to be given to the <i>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</i> . Agricultural land falls into three grades. Grade 1 being the highest. The agricultural land in Basildon is Grade 3. This means that it is not the best and most versatile agricultural land. The NPPF does not	None required	DLP/5786DLPQQ/168

		therefore offer protection to the land at site H10 for agricultural purposes.		
This development will result in the loss of open space.	H10.51	The land allocated for development in this location is private land currently used for agricultural and other purposes. It does not therefore provide open space for public use. The development of this site provides the opportunity for open space to be provided, as set out in the draft policy H10.	None required.	DLP/5786, DLP/368, DLP/9873,
Development in this location will not be affordable as it will be influenced by out-migration from London	H10.52	It is noted that new build house prices attract a premium, as has been seen at the nearby Dunton Fields development. There is a significant demand for housing and new homes which is driving such prices, and highlights the need to increase housing supply in response. The SHMA 2016 highlights this market indicator. Development at site H10 would contribute to that supply. The Council in identifying its OAN for housing as followed the requirements of the NPPF and national PPG, and consequently housing requirements do include a factor for migration as required by the NPPF and PPG. However, demographic change is also a significant driver of housing need in Basildon, and new homes will therefore improve the supply for people already living in the area. In terms of affordability, policy H34 requires all new developments of 11 units or more to provide 25%	None required	DLP/5786

		affordable housing in line with the evidence of such need set forth in the SHMA 2016. The local Allocations Policy would apply to such provision, ensuring that affordable housing is directed to local residents. Development in this location will therefore improve the affordability of housing in Basildon Borough, both in terms of specific affordable housing supply and also through responding to market demand.		
Objects to Dunton becoming a district area of Basildon.	H10.53	Objection noted. However, in order to meet the OAN for housing, as set out in policy SD1, it is necessary for approximately 8,500 homes to be provided in the Green Belt. Impact on the Green Belt has been minimised by identifying all reasonable sources of urban land supply.	None required.	DLP/3339, DLP/3341
Dunton Garden Suburb has not been properly considered.	H10.54	As set out in the Draft Local Plan (alternative options for H10), Brentwood Borough Council need to demonstrate that this is a good/most appropriate option for development within their borough. Basildon Council would need to be sure of this before committing to such a proposal in its own Local Plan, as otherwise the soundness of Basildon's plan would also be at risk. To date this has not occurred and Brentwood have proposed alternative development locations within their Draft Local Plan.	Make efforts to engage Brentwood in considering cross boundary planning issues in order to achieve better planning outcomes.	DLP/5064, DLP/16251, DLP/20144, DLP/20178, DLP/20179, DLP/1556DLPQQ/482, DLPQQ/746

<p>Dissatisfied with the loss of Green Belt and the impact on the village.</p>	<p>H10.55</p>	<p>In order to meet the OAN for housing, as set out in policy SD1, it is necessary to approximately 8,500 homes to be provided in the Green Belt. Impact on the Green Belt has been minimised by identifying all reasonable sources of urban land supply. The selection of sites within the Green Belt for development has been informed by the Green Belt Assessment 2015, and the associated addendum to that document which considers the implications of development on potential development sites on the ongoing purpose and function of the Green Belt. It is recognised that development in this location will change the nature of the settlement of Dunton. Whilst a degree of mitigation of the effects of this can be achieved through the way new development is laid out, accessed and landscape, it is a consequence of this plan which needs to be given consideration. It should however be noted that there are likely to be residents affected by all of the development proposals in the Local Plan, and therefore any approach taken in considering such consequences needs to be balanced and evidence based.</p>	<p>Consider the consequences of the proposals on the settlement of Dunton and residential amenity of residents in this location. Consider 1) opportunities for mitigation; and 2) Evidence based approach to considering impacts. An approach which is inconsistently applied would fail at examination.</p>	<p>DLP/2, DLP/13, DLP/14, DLP/7278, DLP/7279, DLP/7280, DLP/7281, DLP/7298, DLP/7299, DLP/7301, DLP/7314, DLP/7327, DLP/7442, DLP/7452, DLP/7462, DLP/7471, DLP/7477, DLP/7480, DLP/7481, DLP/7487, DLP/7488, DLP/7489, DLP/7497, DLP/7498, DLP/7499, DLP/7507, DLP/7508, DLP/7516, DLP/7517, DLP/7518, DLP/7526, DLP/7527, DLP/7528, DLP/7536, DLP/7538, DLP/7546, DLP/7547, DLP/7548, DLP/7556, DLP/7557, DLP/7558, DLP/7566, DLP/7567, DLP/7568, DLP/7576, DLP/7577, DLP/7578, DLP/7586, DLP/7587, DLP/7588, DLP/7596, DLP/7597, DLP/7598, DLP/7606, DLP/7607, DLP/7608, DLP/7617, DLP/7618, DLP/7619, DLP/8044, DLP/8045, DLP/8046, DLP/8494, DLP/18226, DLP/18308, DLP/18312, DLP/18316, DLP/18318, DLP/18365, DLP/18368, DLP/18372, DLP/18436, DLP/18440, DLP/18441, DLP/18451 DLP/18451, DLP/18453, DLP/18455, DLP/18469, DLP/18473, DLP/18475, DLP/18478, DLP/18493, DLP/18507, DLP/18510, DLP/18512, DLP/18527, DLP/18528, DLP/18529, DLP/18546, DLP/18547, DLP/18548, DLP/18561, DLP/18565, DLP/18568, DLP/18580, DLP/18581, DLP/18582, DLP/18599, DLP/18602, DLP/18603, DLP/18612, DLP/18614, DLP/18617, DLP/18635, DLP/18636, DLP/18637, DLP/18660, DLP/18664, DLP/18677, DLP/18679, DLP/18681, DLP/18695, DLP/18697, DLP/18698, DLP/18711, DLP/18714, DLP/18717,</p>
--	---------------	---	--	---

				DLP/18730, DLP/18732, DLP/18734, DLP/18749, DLP/18750, DLP/18751, DLP/18767, DLP/18769, DLP/18785, DLP/18786, DLP/18789, DLP/18805, DLP/18814, DLP/18815, DLP/18834, DLP/18835, DLP/18837, DLP/18847, DLP/18848, DLP/18849, DLP/18858, DLP/18859, DLP/18860, DLP/18868, DLP/18869, DLP/18870, DLP/18878, DLP/18879, DLP/18881, DLP/18900, DLP/18902, DLP/18903, DLP/18925, DLP/18926, DLP/18928, DLP/18947, DLP/18949, DLP/18950, DLP/18982, DLP/18983, DLP/18984, DLP/18998, DLP/19001, DLP/19003, DLP/19016, DLP/19017, DLP/19019, DLP/19031, DLP/19033, DLP/19034, DLP/19054, DLP/19077, DLP/19078, DLP/19080, DLP/19100, DLP/19101 DLP/19102, DLP/19119, DLP/19121, DLP/19122, DLP/19139, DLP/19141, DLP/19142, DLP/19158, DLP/19171, DLP/19172, DLP/19173, DLP/19189, DLP/19192, DLP/19193, DLP/19206, DLP/19207, DLP/19208, DLP/19225, DLP/19226, DLP/19228, DLP/19242, DLP/19243, DLP/19244, DLP/19255, DLP/19263, DLP/19264, DLP/19277, DLP/19279, DLP/19294, DLP/19306, DLP/19295, DLP/19296, DLP/19307, DLP/19308, DLP/19323, DLP/19324 DLP/19325, DLP/20483, DLP/20484, DLP/20485, DLP/20576, DLP/20577, DLP/20578, DLP/20584,
Laindon centre is a considerable distance from H10.	H10.56	In order to enable residents of the site to meet their local needs without having to travel too far, a local centre is proposed to be provided as part of	None required.	DLP/368

		this development, with the main retail provided by Laindon town centre.		
A decentralised energy facility would not be suitable on H10.	H10.57	While the opportunity would be taken to investigate, and if possible make provision for decentralised energy provision, policy is clear that any provision for decentralised energy that is secured on this site must comply with policy CC7 in order to limit impacts to residential amenity.	None required.	DLP/368
Concerned about the impact of noise or other related construction activity on residents near H 10.	H10.58	It is recognised that construction noise and traffic can cause amenity issues for those living near development sites for a temporary period of time. It is also recognised that the proposal in this location will bring more construction traffic into an area which has seen development in recent years. Given the concerns raised, it is proposed that an additional requirement is introduced into the policy regarding Pollution and Residential Amenity to enable controls to be put in place in respect of construction traffic movements, mitigation of impacts and remediation of any damage. This would apply to all developments including site H10.	Consider the introduction of additional requirements regarding construction impacts within the policy on Pollution and Residential Amenity.	DLP/368DLPQQ/738
The area around H10 should be designated a SSSI.	H10.59	Natural England is responsible for identifying and protecting SSSIs in England under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Sites are identified using specialist judgment. See Natural England's 'Designation Strategy' and 'SSSI Notification Strategy' for more information on how SSSIs are chosen.	None required.	DLP/368

Impact of development on this site on recreational activities.	H10.60	Part 2 of policy H10 requires the on-site provision of open space. Part 5 of policy H10 also requires no harm to biodiversity, including compliance with policy NE5. Policy NE5 sets out a comprehensive, NPPF compliant approach to the conservation and management of ecology and biodiversity where development is proposed. That being said, the NPPF does expect local authorities to seek benefits for biodiversity, and for a strategic approach to be taken to GI. The incorporation of GI within the masterplan for this site will therefore be appropriate and policy H10 will be amended accordingly to require this.	Amend policy H10 to require GI provision within the masterplan for the site.	DLP/368
Concern about health impacts of proximity of potential homes to pylons.	H10.61	Safeguarding distances recommended by the Anglian Water and UK Power Networks have been applied in identifying the extent of this site. Additionally, landscaped buffers would be provided running east-west and north-south through the site following the route of electricity pylons and gas pipelines.	None required.	DLP/368
Dunton has an excessive allocation of Traveller pitches/ Object to G&T sites in Dunton.	H10.62	A decision was taken to not make provision for the need arising from the large unauthorised encampment that previously occupied the Dale Farm site. As a consequence of the overall requirement reducing, the need to secure new provision on large sites such as H10 diminished. This decision was taken later in the day, and whilst the requirement was removed from policy H10, the reference was not removed from the supporting text. Assuming the	If the Council's position regarding the provision of accommodation of gypsies and travellers remains unchanged, update paragraph 11.89 to remove cross reference to policy H3.	DLP/368, DLP/823, DLP/517 DLPQQ/359, DLPQQ/479

		Council's position in this regard removes unchanged, paragraph 11.89 will need amending to remove this requirement.		
Concern raised over the Dunton Garden Suburb proposal.	H10.63	Dunton Garden Suburb was a potential cross-boundary development in conjunction with Brentwood Borough Council which was subject to a joint public consultation in 2015. A summary report of the consultation comments was published in December 2015. The Council considered the option to secure this cross-boundary development, however this option was discounted in the absence of appropriate evidence from Brentwood, as it is not known if the proposal is the most appropriate option for their area. However, in order to meet the OAN for housing, as set out in policy SD1, it is still necessary for approximately 8,500 homes to be provided in the Green Belt. Policy H 10, Mixed Use Development Site - West Basildon Urban Extension include proposals to accommodate 1,000 homes, a residential care/nursing home and employment land, as well as safeguarded areas for development beyond the current plan period. The selection of sites within the Green Belt for development has been informed by the Green Belt Assessment 2015, and the associated addendum to that document which considers the implications of development on	The Council will continue to undertake further engagement with Brentwood Borough to determine a shared approach to the Green Belt which best preserves the strategic gap between Basildon and West Horndon.	DLP/8,DLP/541 DLP/9, DLP/13, DLP/14, DLP/176, DLP/264, DLP/1028, DLP/3308, DLP/10002,DLPQQ/45, DLPQQ/144, DLPQQ/106, DLPQQ/200, DLPQQ/299, DLPQQ/359, DLPQQ/301, DLPQQ/343, DLPQQ/385, DLPQQ/749, DLPQQ/987

		potential development sites on the ongoing purpose and function of the Green Belt.		
Site H10b should be one of the first sites to be released for development and not safeguarded for development post-2034 because it makes no contribution to the Green Belt.	H10.64	In line with the NPPF, the Council must demonstrate that its objectively assessed need can be met on sites that are ready for development. While land in this location had hitherto not been promoted for development, the Outline Landscape Appraisals indicated that should land in this location be promoted for development purposes, it would be possible to accommodate a further 1,350 homes alongside other development and infrastructure requirements. It is therefore expected that H10b will be safeguarded for the provision of around a further 1,350 high quality homes, a residential care and/or nursing home and a 2fe primary school beyond the current plan period. This is consistent with Paragraph 85 of the NPPF which states that 'local planning authorities should where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period'.	None required.	DLP/2746

Impact of development of this site on road safety.	H10.65	Discussions took place with Essex County Council regarding appropriate access arrangements for sites in drafting the Draft Local Plan. This work will be reviewed to ensure that the access arrangements for sites are safe. If necessary, amendments will be made to policies to ensure this is the case.	Review the safety of access arrangements for site H10 with ECC, and if necessary amend the requirements of policy H10.	DLP/3308DLPQQ/468
The Council should take into account, the impact of Policy H10/E7 on Thurrock.	H10.66	It is recognised that development in this location will also impact on strategic infrastructure such as the A127. Therefore, the Council is liaising with Essex County Council, as the Highway authority, to understand their representations in relation to this strategic piece of infrastructure and any phasing of development that is required to support improvements to this route.	Introduce phasing into the submission Local Plan, having regard to discussions with ECC on infrastructure requirements.	DLP/5881, DLP/20155, DLP/20178, DLP/10002,DLPQQ/182
Support alternative options for more housing/increased density. (option 2,3 & 4)	H10.67	Support noted.	None required	DLP/3004
Objection to alternative option of no allocation (option 1)	H10.68	Objection noted.	None required	DLP/3004
Concern about the combined impact of this allocation in Basildon Borough and the proposal for a garden village in Brentwood Borough.	H10.69	Basildon Council presented the proposals in the Draft Local Plan to other local authorities, including Brentwood, in November 2015. No mention of the proposals emerging in Brentwood Borough were brought to the attention of Basildon Council at that time, resulting in potential impacts being unaddressed in the Draft Local Plan. Efforts will be taken to address some of these issues in	Undertake additional engagement with Brentwood Borough to address strategic planning issues.	DLP/3DLPQQ/127, DLPQQ/217, DLPQQ/239, DLPQQ/468, DLPQQ/930, DLPQQ/390, DLPQQ/420

		the submission Local Plan, however at this time Basildon Council remains unconvinced by Brentwood's Local Plan due to the lack of evidence supporting the allocations proposed.		
Proposes alternative location for H10 allocation in Brentwood Borough by A128	H10.70	All Local Planning Authorities have a statutory duty to prepare their own local plans and go as far as is reasonably possible in meeting their own development needs in line with the Government's growth agenda. The Council can only control what happens in their administrative area and the Council has a legal obligation to provide for the Borough's development needs. The most appropriate locations for development within the Borough have been determined through application of the communal result of all documents contributing to the Council's Local Plan evidence base. The Council considered the option to secure cross-boundary development known as Dunton Garden Suburb which incorporated land in both Borough's, however this option was discounted in the absence of appropriate evidence from Brentwood, as it is not known if the proposal is the most appropriate option for their area. However, the Council will continue to engage with Brentwood Council to address strategic planning issues.	The Council will continue to undertake further engagement with Brentwood Borough Council.	DLP/13, DLP/14,
Basildon Council and the Highways Authority have objected to plans for 50 houses on Lower	H10.71	Noted. Housing need alone does not constitute exceptional circumstances in itself for changing Green Belt boundaries, as set out in the PPG. It	Consider the implications of additional work around site access and local junctions, and add to policy requirements accordingly.	DLPQQ/32, DLPQQ/33

Dunton Road on traffic grounds, but are considering alternative development on the same road.		is the range of benefits that sites in the Green Belt can bring that provides exceptional circumstances. It is considered by the Council that the benefits that site H10 can provide provides such exceptional circumstances to justify the wider release of this site for residential development. The Council therefore considers its approach to this matter is justified. However, it is recognised that there will be localised infrastructure impacts, and additional work is therefore being undertaken around site access and local junctions in particular. This will be used to enhance the policy requirements for sites as appropriate.		
No specific comment regarding mobile homes.	H10.72	Noted.	None required.	DLP/18500, DLP/19327,
Satisfied with the amount of consideration given to the circumstances of living in mobile homes.	H10.73	Noted.	None required.	DLP/7436, DLP/7446, DLP/7456, DLP/7466, DLP/7476, DLP/8492
Not satisfied with the amount of consideration given to the circumstances of living in mobile homes.	H10.74	The Council will consider the impact of new development on mobile homes.	Consider impact on mobile homes and amend policy H10 to require development separation and landscape buffering between any proposed development and the park home site.	DLP/7284, DLP/7304, DLP/7491, DLP/7501, DLP/7510, DLP/7520, DLP/7530, DLP/7540, DLP/7550, DLP/7560, DLP/7570, DLP/7580, DLP/7590, DLP/7600, DLP/7610, DLP/7621, DLP/7622, DLP/18326, DLP/18374, DLP/18443, DLP/18460, DLP/18480, DLP/18495, DLP/18515, DLP/18532, DLP/18551, DLP/18573, DLP/18585, DLP/18606, DLP/18622, DLP/18643, DLP/18669, DLP/18685, DLP/18700, DLP/18720, DLP/18739,

				DLP/18755, DLP/18771, DLP/18792, DLP/18818, DLP/18840, DLP/18851, DLP/18862, DLP/18872, DLP/18885, DLP/18908, DLP/18930, DLP/18955, DLP/18986, DLP/19005, DLP/19021, DLP/19037, DLP/19064, DLP/19084, DLP/19107, DLP/19126, DLP/19144, DLP/19160, DLP/19165, DLP/19175, DLP/19197, DLP/19210, DLP/19230, DLP/19246, DLP/19266, DLP/19281, DLP/19298, DLP/19310, DLP/20487, DLP/20580, DLP/20582,
Impact of development in this location on traffic flows, speed and road safety.	H10.75	It is noted that there are concerns additional development in this location will cause further movements, and increased speed and concerns over road safety. Additional work is being carried out in respect of local access and local junctions to identify specified local highways improvements associated with each site. The concerns in relation to Westmayne will be integrated into this work to determine whether any requirements for local improvements can be included within policy H10.	Consider the implications of additional work around site access and local junctions, and add to policy requirements accordingly.	DLPQQ/48, DLPQQ/76, DLPQQ/153, DLPQQ/156, DLPQQ/239, DLPQQ/406, DLPQQ/845, DLPQQ/749, DLPQQ/734, DLPQQ/738
Object to the allocation in policy H10.	H10.76	Objection noted	None required	DLPQQ/75, DLPQQ/544
No particular concern regarding the impact of development on the village of Dunton Wayletts	H10.77	Noted.	None required.	DLP/7430, DLP/19058, DLP/19163, DLP/7299
Object to Alternative Option 3.	H10.78	Objection noted	None required	
There is a gas pipeline running through the site	H10.79	Noted.	Noted.	DLP/7435, DLP/7445, DLP/7455, DLP/7465, DLP/7475, DLP/8491

which should not be built on or near. No concern regarding the presence of a gas pipeline in site H10.				
Concerns raised in relation to the Dunton Fields development including the provision of education, recreation and health facilities.	H10.80	Noted. However, the development proposal has already received planning permission and therefore the decision to allocate the site for development has already been made outside the preparation of the Draft Local Plan.	None required.	DLPQQ/997
Impact of development in this location on soil and water contamination	H10.81	Chapter 15, Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change and Flooding, is clear on how the Local Plan will help to shape places to secure reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimising vulnerability and providing resilience to the impacts of climate change, and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure in line with the NPPF. In addition, Policy NE 7 seeks to ensure that development is designed to reduce adverse impacts on residential amenity.	None required.	DLPQQ/239
Masterplan should guide development in H10.	H10.82	Policy H10 states that a masterplan is required for this site to ensure the efficient and effective use of land and the provision of sufficient infrastructure.	None required	DLPQQ/239
The location of the proposed traveller pitch seem disadvantageous for developers, and should be nearer the railway.	H10.83	A decision was taken to not make provision for the need arising from the large unauthorised encampment that previously occupied the Dale Farm site. As a consequence of the overall requirement reducing, the need to secure new provision on	If the Council's position regarding the provision of accommodation of gypsies and travellers remains unchanged, remove cross reference to policy H3.	DLPQQ/459

		large sites such as H10 diminished. This decision was taken later in the day, and whilst the requirement was removed from policy H10, the reference was not removed from the supporting text. Assuming the Council's position in this regard removes unchanged, the plan will need amending to remove this requirement.		
H10 does not include infrastructure for non-motorised/sustainable transport modes.	H10.84	Criteria 2(f) of Policy H10, which relates to the site allocation to the west of Basildon, sets out the requirements for new and improvements to existing public transport and cycling routes as part of the development.	None required.	DLPQQ/406
Concern over highway upgrades in Dunton as the map indicates they pass over a historical building "Mulebbis"	H10.85	The route shown on the policies map is indicative only. No decisions have been made as to the exact location or the final design of any highway upgrades. The Council will be commissioning additional highway modelling to determine more specific routes for the larger highway upgrades and to provide recommendations for safe access into and out of areas allocated for future housing growth. This will be published alongside the next version of the Local Plan scheduled for consultation in early 2017.		DLP/89, DLP/167
Object to allocation H11 due to impact on infrastructure.	H11.2	Additional infrastructure is proposed as part of this plan, as set out in chapters 9 and 13. Policy IMP1 expects the delivery of new infrastructure alongside the delivery of housing and other forms of development. However, it is recognised that there will be localised infrastructure impacts, and additional work is therefore being undertaken around site access and local junctions in particular. This will be used to enhance the policy	Consider the implications of additional work around site access and local junctions, and add to policy requirements accordingly.	DLP/11, DLP/15, DLP/48, DLP/453, DLP/547, DLP/659, DLP/669, DLP/849, DLP/870, DLP/1131, DLP/1915, DLP/9611, DLP/10312, DLP/17177 DLP/20641,DLPQQ/908

		requirements for sites as appropriate.		
A small traveller site should be included within requirements of policy H11.	H11.3	The evidence on the need for the accommodation of Gypsies and Travellers does not indicate a need to make additional allocations for sites, unless those identified in the Draft Local Plan are unacceptable and an alternative is required.	None required.	DLP/149, DLP/2551
Drainage undertaker welcomes reference within policy H11 to the alignment of development with drainage infrastructure improvements.	H11.4	Support of policy wording in relation to drainage infrastructure noted	None required	DLP/4408
Development location represents encroachment into the Countryside / impact on rural character.	H11.5	The OAN for housing is greater than the capacity of the urban area, which has meant that land within the current extent of the Green Belt has been identified for housing purposes. It is noted that this will have some impact on the Countryside. However, in order to identify sites which would minimise harm to the landscape, Outline Landscape Appraisals have been undertaken to identify developable areas within those sites promoted for development. Site H11 is based on this assessment, and forms part of a much larger site which was initially assessed but largely found to have too great an impact on the landscape. The identification of site H11 is therefore based on evidence of landscape impact.	None required.	DLP/659, DLP/669, DLP/2208, DLP/2551, DLP/9611, DLP/10312,

Impact on the views from the north from Little Burstead Church.	H11.6	The land identified for allocation as site H11, when viewed from the north sits against the backdrop of the industrial buildings forming the Ford Dunton Installation. Photographs of this are available within the Outline Landscape Appraisal of this site. Development in this location will not therefore impact significantly on the quality of views from the north.	None required.	DLP/2551
Concern about the loss of agricultural land.	H11.7	It is noted that the site proposed in policy H11 is currently used for agricultural purposes. It is however being promoted for development by the landowner, and therefore it is not necessarily the intention of the landowner to continue with his agricultural practice in the future. The NPPF requires the highest level of protection to be given to the <i>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</i> . Agricultural land falls into three grades. Grade 1 being the highest. The agricultural land in Basildon is in Grade 3. This means that it is not the best and most versatile agricultural land. The NPPF does not therefore offer protection to the land at site H11 for agricultural purposes.	None required	DLP/849, DLP/1131
Impact of development of this site on road safety.	H11.8	Discussions took place with Essex County Council regarding appropriate access arrangements for sites in drafting the Draft Local Plan. This work will be reviewed to ensure that the access arrangements for sites are safe. If necessary, amendments will be made to policies to ensure this is the case.	Review the safety of access arrangements for site H11 with ECC, and if necessary amend the requirements of policy H11.	DLP/547

Impact of development at this site on wildlife.	H11.9	The allocations identified in the Draft Local Plan were subject to Ecology Appraisals. These appraisals were used to ensure that the allocations, and extent of allocations were appropriate in terms of their impact on wildlife.	None required	DLP/453, DLP/659, DLP/669 , DLP/1131, DLP/2208, DLP/13012,
As an alternative to this site, regenerate Laindon Town Centre.	H11.10	The NPPF requires local planning authorities to meet their OAN for housing which is within the range of 15,270 and 16,730 homes over a twenty year period. In order to achieve this a detailed review has been undertaken of the urban area to identify its capacity. This reveals a capacity of around 8,000 homes, including supply arising from the regeneration of Laindon Town Centre. There is a need to release additional land, within the current extent of the Green Belt, in addition to the capacity in the existing urban area in order to meet the OAN for housing. Regeneration of Laindon Town Centre for housing is not therefore a potential alternative to this site, but does prevent the need for further Green Belt release to accommodate housing needs.	None required.	DLP/870
Not a sustainable development location.	H11.11	The allocations in the Draft Local Plan were subject to sustainability appraisal as part of their identification. The sustainability appraisal concludes that this site is appropriate for allocation in terms of sustainability.	None required	DLP/453
There is a gas main running through this site.	H11.12	The Council has checked the presence of Gas mains in this location with mapping provided by	None required	DLP/453

		National Grid Gas and the British Pipeline Agency. There is no gas main in this location.		
Concerns about flood risk arising from site H11.	H11.13	The proposed allocations in the Draft Local Plan have been subject to a flood risk sequential test, and found to be sequentially appropriate. That being said, it is recognised that areas of the borough are susceptible to surface water flood risk. Consequently, policy H11 requires consideration of flood risk matters in the development of the site, with compliance with policy CC4 required.	None required.	DLP/1131, DLP/1915
The proposal for this allocation represents over-development.	H11.14	The Outline Landscape Appraisals were used to determine both the extent of development proposed in an area and the appropriate development density. The density of development proposed on this site is in line with the lowest density normally considered appropriate by the NPPF when making efficient use of land. It is not therefore considered that the proposal for this site represents over-development.	None required.	DLP/1131
This development will result in the loss of open space.	H11.15	The land allocated for development in this location is private land currently used for agricultural purposes. It does not therefore provide open space for public use. The development of this site provides the opportunity for open space to be provided.	None required.	DLP/1131
The education needs of development at this scale on this site can be met through expanding existing schools nearby.	H11.16	Information noted.	None required.	DLP/2614

Object to allocation H11 due to impact on Green Belt.	H11.17	Noted.	None required.	DLP/11, DLP/15, DLP/1131
Developer seeks modifications to the extent of the site, its capacity and its infrastructure requirements, reflecting evidence that they have gathered.	H11.18	The information submitted by this developer will be considered against the Council's evidence base in order to ensure that the allocation is appropriate in terms of its size, proposed housing provision and the infrastructure required.	Review this allocation to ensure it is appropriate in all respects, having regard to the evidence base.	DLP/7045
Drainage undertaker welcomes reference within policy H12 to the alignment of development with drainage infrastructure improvements.	H12.1	Support of policy wording in relation to drainage infrastructure noted	None required	DLP/4409
A small traveller site should be included within requirements of policy H12.	H12.2	The evidence on the need for the accommodation of Gypsies and Travellers does not indicate a need to make additional allocations for sites, unless those identified in the Draft Local Plan are unacceptable and an alternative is required.	None required, at this time.	DLP/150
Support for reference to historic assets in the supporting text to policy H12.	H12.3	Support noted	None required	DLP/720
Reference to the Noak Bridge conservation area should be included within the considerations identified for policy H12.	H12.4	It is agreed that reference should be made to the Noak Bridge conservation area, and the submission Local Plan will be amended accordingly to include this.	Amend supporting text to policy H12 to ensure reference to the Noak Bridge conservation area.	DLP/720, DLP/2758
Requirements for ecological assessment, mitigation and enhancement strategy	H12.5	The Local Plan should be read as a whole. Part 5 of policy H12 requires no harm to biodiversity, including compliance with policy NE5. Policy	None required	DLP/2732

<p>should be set out in policy H12.</p>		<p>NE5 sets out a comprehensive, NPPF compliant approach to the conservation and management of ecology and biodiversity where development is proposed. It is considered that the impacts of development on ecology in this location can be fully managed by the policies set out in the Draft Local Plan without amendment.</p>		
<p>Object to allocation H12 due to impact on Green Belt.</p>	<p>H12.6</p>	<p>Objection noted. However, in order to meet the OAN for housing, as set out in policy SD1, it is necessary to approximately 8,500 homes to be provided in the Green Belt. Impact on the Green Belt has been minimised by identifying all reasonable sources of urban land supply. Green Belt sites have been selected using evidence from the Green Belt Study 2015, and the Outline Landscape Appraisals. It is considered that a sufficient gap is left to the east of Noak Bridge to prevent Noak Bridge merging with Crays Hill.</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>DLP/16, DLP/771, DLP/1231, DLP/1234, DLP/1650, DLP/1750, DLP/1774, DLP/1812, DLP/1814, DLP/2314, DLP/2552, DLP/2758, DLP/2855, DLP/3451, DLP/3463, DLP/3898, DLPQQ/856, DLPQQ/776 DLPQQ/383, DLPQQ/382</p>
<p>Object to allocation H12 due to impact on infrastructure.</p>	<p>H12.7</p>	<p>Additional infrastructure is proposed as part of this plan, as set out in chapters 9 and 13. Policy IMP1 expects the delivery of new infrastructure alongside the delivery of housing and other forms of development. However, it is recognised that there will be localised infrastructure impacts, and additional work is therefore being undertaken around site access and local junctions in particular. This will be used to enhance the policy</p>	<p>Consider the implications of additional work around site access and local junctions, and add to policy requirements accordingly.</p>	<p>DLP/16, DLP/540, DLP/861, DLP/862, DLP/990, DLP/1112, DLP/1182, DLP/1234, DLP/1750, DLP/1774, DLP/1812, DLP/1907, DLP/2314, DLP/2758, DLP/2855, DLP/3014, DLP/3463, DLP/3898, DLP/1775, DLP/20173, DLP/20242, DLPQQ/14, DLPQQ/61, DLPQQ/180, DLPQQ/374, DLPQQ/383, DLPQQ/382, DLPQQ/490, DLPQQ/776, DLPQQ/753, DLPQQ/530</p>

		requirements for sites as appropriate.		
Impact of development of this site on road safety.	H12.8	Discussions took place with Essex County Council regarding appropriate access arrangements for sites in drafting the Draft Local Plan. This work will be reviewed to ensure that the access arrangements for sites are safe. If necessary, amendments will be made to policies to ensure this is the case.	Review the safety of access arrangements for site H12 with ECC, and if necessary amend the requirements of policy H12.	DLP/861DLPQQ/61, DLPQQ/906, DLPQQ/858, DLPQQ/856
New development should of a high quality of design, complementing existing quality of Noak Bridge.	H12.9	It is agreed that development at Noak Bridge should be of a high quality that complements the surrounding area. Policies within chapter 12 of the Local Plan advocate such a high standard of design.	None required.	DLP/988
A travel plan is needed for Noak Bridge School to reduce parking and traffic.	H12.10	It is agreed that schools should have travel plans to minimise parking and congestion at peak times. The proposed development location is close to the existing school, and a new school is proposed alongside the development. Consequently, this development should not add to school time issues, as residents will be sufficiently close to walk.	None required.	DLP/988
Development proposed will impact on the character of Noak Bridge.	H12.11	Noak Bridge has been developed as a series of estates over a period of time, with the most recent additional occurring in the 1980s. It is not therefore considered that a well designed estate in the identified location will be out of character with the existing settlement.	None required	DLP/771 DLP/990, DLP/1112, DLP/1234, DLP/1750, DLP/1774, DLP/1812, DLP/2314, DLP/2758, DLP/2855, DLP/3463, DLP/3898,DLPQQ/180, DLPQQ/383, DLPQQ/382, DLPQQ/490, DLPQQ/776
Loss of open space arising from	H12.12	The land allocated for development purposes is private land currently	None required	DLP/3463

development in this location.		used for grazing. It is not open space. The policy for this site seeks the extension of the existing nature reserve to the South, increasing the amount of open space available in this location rather than decreasing it.		
Impact on the landscape setting of Noak Bridge.	H12.13	All potential sites considered for inclusion within the Draft Local Plan were subject to an Outline Landscape Appraisal to determine the landscape impact that would arise from development. This allowed for those sites with the least impact on the landscape to be identified. Therefore, whilst it is recognised that there will be some localised affects from development on the landscape, it is considered that the overall quality of the landscape across the borough will be maintained.	None required	DLP/990, DLP/1112, DLP/1234, DLP/1812, DLP/2855
Impact on wildlife of development in this location.	H12.14	All potential sites were subject to Ecology Assessments prior to inclusion in the Draft Local Plan. The Ecology Assessment for this site identified the need to provide space around the existing nature reserve to the south of this site for nature conservation purposes, and therefore policy H12 was worded to ensure that this space was retained for this. Policy H12 also requires compliance with policy NE5, ensuring that a net gain in biodiversity is an outcome of development in this location. This site and its associated policy allocation and requirements are	None required	DLP/1112, DLP/1234, DLP/1750, DLP/1812, DLP/1897, DLP/2314, DLP/2758, DLP/2855, DLP/3014, DLP/3463, DLP/3898, DLP/771, DLP/20173, DLP/20242, DLP/20337, DLP/20502, DLPQQ/61, DLPQQ/180, DLPQQ/374, DLPQQ/906, DLPQQ/383, DLPQQ/382, DLPQQ/490, DLPQQ/776, DLPQQ/753, DLPQQ/530

		therefore appropriate in respect of ecology considerations.		
Concerns about flood risk arising from site H12.	H12.15	The proposed allocations in the Draft Local Plan have been subject to a flood risk sequential test, and found to be sequentially appropriate. That being said, it is recognised that areas of the borough are susceptible to surface water flood risk. Consequently, policy H12 requires consideration of flood risk matters in the development of the site, with compliance with policy CC4 required.	None required.	DLP/1234, DLP/1774, DLP/1812, DLP/1897, DLP/1907, DLP/2855, DLP/3014, DLP/3463DLPQQ/910, DLPQQ/906, DLPQQ/383, DLPQQ/382, DLPQQ/753, DLPQQ/529
Developer with interest in proposed allocation H12 supports the allocation and general approach set out in policy H12, but objects to the need to provide a 2fe Primary School.	H12.16	General support noted. The requirement for a 2fe primary school on this site reflects information provided to the Borough Council by Essex County as the Schools planning authority. It would not be acceptable for this development to go ahead without sufficient school provision within the local area to support growth. However, it is recognised that the advice of the School planning authority can change over a relatively short period of time, and therefore in the process of finalising the submission Local Plan the Borough Council will check with Essex County Council as the scale of primary school provision required to support growth in this settlement.	Liaise with Essex County Council to ensure that the primary school requirement set out in policy H12 is aligned with the growth expected to arise in the Noak Bridge settlement, and is therefore justified in planning terms. If appropriate amend policy H12 to reflect the outcomes of this.	DLP/4453
Noak Bridge Nature Reserve should be extended eastwards onto land promoted through the HELAA.	H12.17	It is noted that there is land to the east of the current nature reserve which could be used to extend the nature reserve. The Draft Local Plan proposes that this land be retained	None required.	DLP/1298

		within the Green Belt. Policy GB11 supports proposals which would put land within the Green Belt into positive uses, such as for nature conservation purposes.		
Support for higher density development consistent with the first phase of Noak Bridge.	H12.18	Support for higher density development at Noak Bridge noted. It is recognised that this would reduce the need for further Green Belt release, and would potentially be in keeping with the character of the settlement if designed appropriately. Further consideration will therefore be given to this proposal.	Give further consideration to the appropriateness of higher density development at this site, consistent with the first phase of Noak Bridge. If appropriate, amend policy H12 accordingly.	DLP/2552
Reservoir flood risk may limit the extent that development can be accommodated on this site (Environment Agency)	H12.19	When work was previously undertaken on the SFRA, the Environment Agency was not able to make Reservoir flood risk information available, as there were issues with commercial sensitivity associated with it. This information is now available, and will need to be reviewed in order to determine whether site H12 is appropriate in flood risk terms.	Amend the sequential test to include a consideration of flood risk from reservoirs. If appropriate amend the extent of the developable area for site H12 to reflect the outcomes of the sequential test.	DLP/2862
Concern that the moat at Laindon Ponds is a heritage asset that will be lost as a consequence of development.	H12.20	The policies in chapter 17 set out the Council's approach to heritage assets which sets out a clear approach to their conservation. It is however recognised that the heritage asset at Laindon Ponds has not been noted in the supporting text. The Council will therefore investigate this matter and determine whether it needs to be protected alongside any development occurring in this location.	Review the heritage asset at Laindon Ponds, and determine whether it requires protection as part of policy H12.	DLP/2758, DLP/2855DLPQQ/858

<p>Consideration should be given to alternative sites nearby, as identified in the HELAA.</p>	<p>H12.21</p>	<p>Consideration was given through the plan-preparation process to a number of potential development sites in the vicinity of Noak Bridge, including land to the north of Wash Road. It was found through the evidence base work which included Outline Landscape Appraisals, Sustainability Appraisal and Sequential Flood Risk Assessment that the development location identified in policy H12 was appropriate having regard to reasonable alternatives nearby.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLP/2855</p>
<p>Densities on this site should be lower, consistent with those sought on sites adjacent to Billericay.</p>	<p>H12.22</p>	<p>The densities identified for site H12 were informed by the findings of the Outline Landscape Appraisals which considered the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development, having regard to the surrounding area, including the adjacent residential area. Noak Bridge is developed to a densities which currently reach up to 45 dwelling units per hectare. 35 dwelling units per hectare is therefore evidenced as being appropriate in this location. Reducing densities without good cause would result in the need for more land to be used to deliver the same quantum of homes, resulting in further incursions into the current extent of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLP/3463</p>
<p>No alternatives considered for policy H12</p>	<p>H12.23</p>	<p>Three alternative options were considered in relation to policy H12. These were set out on page 143 of the Draft Local Plan, and were</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLP/1235, DLP/1815</p>

		considered by the Sustainability Appraisal.		
Promotes alternative land to the north of Wash Road as a housing development location.	H12.24	Consideration was given to development to the north of Wash Road in the preparation of the Draft Local Plan. Land in this location was subject to Landscape Appraisal, Ecology Assessment, infrastructure enquiries and Sustainability Appraisal. There were concerns however that development in this location would have a significant impact on the landscape. There are also issues with developing north of Wash Road, and the robustness of any new Green Belt boundary that would be created. However, this promoter has included additional information with regard to the merits of their proposal, and these should be considered before the plan is finalised to ensure that the Council is satisfied that the most appropriate suite of sites has been identified.	Review the additional information provided with regard to land North of Wash Road, and determine whether it should be included as an addition/alternative to policy H12 in particular, or any other site within the Local Plan.	DLP/3770
The provision of a primary school on this site cannot be justified on the basis of the scale of development. However, there are likely to be difficulties in expanding the capacity of the nearby school. Provision may need to be made to the South of the A127.	H12.25	Policy H12 currently seeks the provision of a school on-site. However, given the County Council's position, it may be difficult to justify this requirement going forward, and policy H12 may need to be amended accordingly. Further consideration needs to be given as to if and how the education needs arising from this site can be met, having regard not just to capacity to the South of the A127, but also in the nearby Crays Hill School. Further engagement will take place with ECC to understand if	Work with the County Council to determine if and how the education needs of this site can be met. If appropriate amend policy H12 to reflect the outcomes of this work.	DLP/2616

		and how education needs of this site can be met..		
Supports allocation H12.	H12.26	Support noted.	None required.	DLP/4461
Object to allocation H12 due to scale of development proposed.	H12.27	Objection noted. However, in order to meet the OAN for housing, as set out in policy SD1, it is necessary to approximately 8,500 homes to be provided in the Green Belt. Impact on the Green Belt has been minimised by identifying all reasonable sources of urban land supply. Green Belt sites have been selected using evidence from the Green Belt Study 2015, and the Outline Landscape Appraisals. The site allocation at Noak Bridge is based on the findings and recommendations of the evidence base which took into account infrastructure provision, the supply of suitable and deliverable sites, and environmental and historic constraints.	None required	DLP/3451DLPQQ/666
Suggests Belvedere Pub site and Barleylands as alternative locations for H12.	H12.28	The Site Allocations within the Draft Local Plan have been identified as the most appropriate locations for development which have been submitted for consideration and are suitable and deliverable based on the findings of a range of studies taking into account infrastructure provision, the supply of suitable and deliverable sites, and environmental and historic constraints. New sites will be considered for their suitability.	Consider recommendations of alternative sites.	DLP/1775
Impact on house price / loss of view	H12.29	It is recognised that some people pay a premium for a view from their	None required.	DLPQQ/14

		property. However, there is no legal right to a view over another persons land, and the planning system does not provide protection in such regards.		
Object to allocation in H12.	H12.30	Objection noted.	None required.	DLPQQ/906, DLPQQ/858, DLPQQ/666
Development in this location will make it undesirable and/or affect property values.	H12.31	Evidence on the benefits of planning recently published by the RTPi shows that well planned development contributes positively to the desirability of an area, and maintain and enhance property values within an area. There is no evidence to suggest that the reverse will occur in this location. Policies within Chapter 12 of the Draft Local Plan deal with ensuring that new development is of a high quality. Property values are not a valid planning consideration that the Council can take into account when developing its Local Plan.	None required.	DLPQQ/856, DLPQQ/666
Drainage undertaker welcomes reference within policy H13 to the alignment of development with drainage infrastructure improvements.	H13.1	Support of policy wording in relation to drainage infrastructure noted	None required	DLP/4410
Make specific reference to the conservation and enhancement of the Church of All Saints at North Benfleet (grade II*) in policy H13.	H13.2	It is agreed that development in this location may have implications for the Church of All Saints at North Benfleet, and policy H13 should be amended to reference the need to conserve and enhance this historic asset.	Amend policy H13 to specifically identify the need to conserve and enhance the Church of All Saints at North Benfleet.	DLP/721

<p>Recreational pressures on Pitsea Marsh SSSI, arising from development on this site should be mitigated through high quality on-site Green Infrastructure provision and/or developer contributions towards measures to increase the resilience of the SSSI (Natural England).</p>	<p>H13.3</p>	<p>Part 3 of policy H13 requires the on-site provision of multi-functional open space, including a large swathe comprising approximately half the site area running through the centre of the site. Part 6 of policy H13 meanwhile requires no harm to biodiversity, including compliance with policy NE5. Policy NE5 sets out a comprehensive, NPPF compliant approach to the conservation and management of ecology and biodiversity where development is proposed. It is considered that the impacts on Pitsea Marsh SSSI of development in this location can be fully managed by the policies set out in the Draft Local Plan without amendment.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLP/2736, DLP/20503,</p>
<p>There is capacity at St Margarets Church of England Primary which is sufficient for Bowers Gifford and North Benfleet's growing population.</p>	<p>H13.4</p>	<p>Essex County Council, as the authority responsible for planning for education provision, were engaged in the preparation of the Draft Local Plan. They advised on the need for a new school to support the level of growth proposed in Bowers Gifford and North Benfleet. It should be noted that St Margarets is a Church of England School, and as such can select its pupils based on faith. Consequently, it does not have to, and cannot be directed to, serve Bowers Gifford and North Benfleet's school needs.</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>DLP/2077, DLP/2452, DLP/2961, DLP/3312, DLP/5689DLPQQ/574</p>
<p>Greater need for explicitly regarding the intentions of the leisure facilities and sports pitches. If sports pitches</p>	<p>H13.5</p>	<p>It is recognised that whilst set out in the supporting text, there is not sufficient detail within the draft policy regarding the intentions for the existing leisure facilities and sports</p>	<p>Amend part 3 of policy H13 to be more explicit about the Council's intentions for the existing leisure and playing pitches within this allocation.</p>	<p>DLP/55, DLP/440, DLP/9585, DLP/635DLPQQ/124</p>

are relocated, they should be accompanied by associated facilities.		pitches within allocation H13. Part 3 of policy H13 should be amended in this regard.		
Concerns about flood risk arising from site H13.	H13.6	The proposed allocations in the Draft Local Plan have been subject to a flood risk sequential test, and found to be sequentially appropriate. That being said, it is recognised that areas of the borough are susceptible to surface water flood risk. Consequently, policy H13 requires consideration of flood risk matters in the development of the site, with compliance with policy CC4 required.	None required.	DLP/444, DLP/513 DLP/1057, DLP/1225, DLP/1409, DLP/2227, DLP/2232, DLP/2279, DLP/2443, DLP/2510, DLP/3313, DLP/3441, DLP/4330, DLP/5689, DLP/7273, DLP/7403, DLP/7432, DLP/7433, DLP/7933, DLP/9587, DLP/20241, DLP/20644, DLPQQ/124, DLPQQ/392, DLPQQ/554, DLPQQ/508, DLPQQ/510, DLPQQ/569, DLPQQ/574, DLPQQ/669, DLPQQ/676, DLPQQ/671, DLPQQ/658, DLPQQ/672
Support for proposals to relocate Eversley Leisure Centre and the playing pitches within the site.	H13.7	Support for the relocation of sports pitches to a more usable location noted.	None required.	DLP/56
Growth on the site should give rise to additional sport provision, either in qualitative or quantitative terms.	H13.8	A large area of open space is identified for open space purposes as part of allocation H13. However, unlike other policies cross reference is not provided within policy H13 to the open space standards set out in policy HC1. Part 3 of policy H13 should be amended to include such a cross reference.	Amend part 3 of policy H13 to cross reference the open space standards in policy HC1.	DLP/56
Object to development in the location allocated in policy H13.	H13.9	Objection noted.	None required.	DLP/845, DLP/2225, DLP/7053, DLP/7054, DLP/9581, DLP/14294, DLPQQ/904, DLPQQ/669, DLPQQ/676, DLPQQ/726

<p>Request that a multi user route is provided running through the open space and this is linked via a safe crossing to the marshland to the South of the A13.</p>	<p>H13.10</p>	<p>It is considered that the north-south open space proposed at this site could support a north-south multi user route. In terms of the potential to provide safe crossing of the A13, consideration would need to be given to this matter by the local highway authority, as this road is of a substantial width, and a new crossing would not be feasible to provide. There may however be an opportunity to use the road that accesses the cemetery and crematorium.</p>	<p>Amend part 3 of policy H13 to make clear that a north-south multi-user route should be provided within the open space. Liaise with ECC to determine whether it is possible to extend this route to the marshes to the South of the A13. If appropriate amend policy H13 and policy TS3 accordingly.</p>	<p>DLP/219, DLP/1435</p>
<p>Concerned about the loss of Green Belt in this location.</p>	<p>H13.11</p>	<p>It is recognised that the proposals in policy H13 are located within the Green Belt. In order to meet the housing needs of the Borough, as identified in policy SD1 it is necessary for around 8,000 homes to be located within the Green Belt. The proposals in policy H13 represent a proportion of the housing requirement in this regard, with development also proposed in the Green Belt elsewhere in Basildon and also in locations around Wickford and Billericay. It is also recognised that the proposals in H13 will erode the gap that exists between Pitsea and Bowers Gifford. This was however considered relative to development to the east of Bowers Gifford between Bowers Gifford and Thundersley. Development in this location would be more harmful to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt than development in the location</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLP/843, DLP/1057, DLP/1105, DLP/1652, DLP/1732, DLP/2077, DLP/2226, DLP/2227, DLP/2232, DLP/2279, DLP/2443, DLP/2961, DLP/3013, DLP/3177, DLP/3316, DLP/4330, DLP/5689, DLP/7054, DLP/1409, DLP/437, DLP/20241, DLP/20644, DLP/7383, DLP/9587, DLP/20232, DLP/7306, DLPQQ/40, DLPQQ/49, DLPQQ/50, DLPQQ/124, DLPQQ/264, DLPQQ/392, DLPQQ/695, DLPQQ/936, DLPQQ/248, DLPQQ/508, DLPQQ/510, DLPQQ/569, DLPQQ/939, DLPQQ/658, DLPQQ/672</p>

		<p>proposed. It was also considered relative to development to the north of Bowers Gifford, which was also considered to be both more harmful to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, and to the sustainability of development. Both these options were rejected. In order to mitigate the impact on the Green Belt, policy H13 is quite clear that a strategic open space gap should be left between Pitsea and Bowers Gifford. Minimum widths are set out in this respect. This will provide both visual separation and a permanent area of open space, with a clearly defined use which will act to prevent the two settlements merging in the long term.</p>		
<p>Concerned that sport club usage of land in this location will prevent recreational use by the public.</p>	H13.12	<p>Policy H13 provides for 75ha of open space on land which in the main is not publicly accessible. This is a substantive increase in open space provision in this location. It is recognised that the location of private sports clubs to this location may mean that residents will not be able to roam freely over all of this space, as to do so would degrade the quality of sports pitches, however it is the intention of the Council to provide sufficient open space for all users in this area as set out in part 3 of policy H13.</p>	None required.	DLP/1057, DLP/1105, DLP/2224, DLP/2961, DLP/4330
<p>Concerned about the potential for light and noise pollution arising from sport club usage.</p>	H13.13	<p>It is noted that there are concerns about the light and noise that may arise from sports uses. Typically grass sports pitches should only be used twice per week in order to</p>	<p>Amend part 3 of policy H13 to ensure that artificial playing pitches are located to minimise harm to residential amenity.</p>	DLP/1057, DLP/1126, DLP/2961, DLP/7403, DLP/9585,

		maintain their quality. Therefore, any noise associated with each pitch should be relatively limited in terms of time. Artificial pitches can be used more frequently, and it is recognised that these are often flood lit to enable evening play. In order to ensure such pitches do not cause harm to residential amenity, part 3 of policy H13 should be amended to address this point.		
Consider the quantum of gypsy and traveller pitches allocated in this location is disproportionate to the allocation in other parts of the Borough.	H13.14	The proposal for policy H13 includes the use of Council owned land within the site for the provision of up to 15 pitches for the accommodation of gypsies and travellers. When considered alongside the quantum of housing proposed this represents just 0.75% of the development planned for in this location and is not therefore considered to be disproportionate. In terms of distribution more widely, pitches are also proposed in other locations where the Council owns land, which includes site H16 in Wickford. Pitches are not proposed in locations where the Council does not have a land interest, and where pitches are not being proposed by private landowners, as it is not considered possible to deliver pitches in such instances and the approach to pitch provision in the local plan would not therefore be effective.	None required.	DLP/1057, DLP/7403, DLPQQ/268

<p>Concerned about the impact of proposals in policy H13 on the character of Bowers Gifford.</p>	<p>H13.15</p>	<p>It is recognised that development in this location will have an effect on the character of Bowers Gifford. In order to control the effect on the settlement of Bowers Gifford, the quantum of development adjacent to this settlement has been limited to 600 homes. Whilst it is recognised that this would effectively double the size of the village, it is not considered that this will necessarily be harmful to the village. Indeed, the increase in homes and population will make the village more sustainable by supporting the provision of services within the settlement including a primary school and GP surgery and a local centre. This will enhance access to services for existing residents within a limited sized settlement which would still be smaller in size than the new Sustainable Garden Villages currently being considered by the Government. As a Neighbourhood Planning Area, the Parish Council in this location can ensure that the design of new development complements the existing settlement, ensuring that the character of Bowers Gifford is enhanced by the new development further.</p>	<p>Emphasis the role of neighbourhood planning in influencing the design of new development adjacent to Bowers Gifford in the supporting text of policy H13.</p>	<p>DLP/1057, DLP/1105, DLP/2226, DLP/2227, DLP/2232, DLP/2279, DLP/2443, DLP/2961, DLP/3177, DLP/3316, DLP/3311, DLP/5689, DLP/5700, DLP/7383, DLP/7403, DLP/452, DLP/513DLPQQ/124, DLPQQ/392, DLPQQ/356, DLPQQ/404, DLPQQ/904, DLPQQ/273, DLPQQ/860, DLPQQ/504, DLPQQ/510, DLPQQ/574, DLPQQ/635, DLPQQ/955, DLPQQ/726, DLPQQ/566</p>
<p>Object to allocation H13 due to impact on infrastructure.</p>	<p>H13.16</p>	<p>Additional infrastructure is proposed as part of this plan, as set out in chapters 9 and 13. Policy IMP1 expects the delivery of new infrastructure alongside the delivery of housing and other forms of development. However, it is</p>	<p>Consider the implications of additional work around site access and local junctions, and add to policy requirements accordingly.</p>	<p>DLP/444, DLP/1126, DLP/1225, DLP/1732, DLP/2224, DLP/2227, DLP/2232, DLP/2279, DLP/2443, DLP/2961, DLP/3311, DLP/3316, DLP/1409, DLP/7273, DLP/7308, DLP/7383, DLP/ 7392, DLP/7403, DLP/7933, DLP/9587, DLPQQ/392,</p>

		recognised that there will be localised infrastructure impacts, and additional work is therefore being undertaken around site access and local junctions in particular. This will be used to enhance the policy requirements for sites as appropriate.		DLPQQ/404, DLPQQ/554, DLPQQ/266, DLPQQ/504, DLPQQ/508, DLPQQ/521, DLPQQ/569, DLPQQ/574, DLPQQ/635, DLPQQ/955
Impact of development at this site on wildlife.	H13.17	The allocations identified in the Draft Local Plan were subject to Ecology Appraisals. These appraisals were used to ensure that the allocations, and extent of allocations were appropriate in terms of their impact on wildlife.	None required	Delph/1126, DLP/1225, DLP/2227, DLP/2232, DLP/2961, DLP/1409, DLP/20503, DLP/20644, DLP/7330, DLP/7432, DLP/7433, DLP/7934, DLP/9587, DLPQQ/554, DLPQQ/268, DLPQQ/504, DLPQQ/508
Ilfracombe Avenue will no longer be part of Bowers Gifford but part of Pitsea.	H13.18	Noted. Ilfracombe Avenue is currently not part of the concentrated settlement of Bowers Gifford - it is remote from it. Frontage development along the London Road has already brought Ilfracombe Avenue closer to Pitsea.	None required	DLP/1126
Loss of open space arising from development in this location	H13.19	Policy H13 is clear that 75ha of open space should be provided in this location. This compensates for the loss of Eversley Park, with the re-provision of the park on flatter ground which enables playing pitch provision and use supported by Sports England.	None required.	DLP/1294, DLP/3311, DLP/437, DLP/3310, DLP/625DLPQQ/554, DLPQQ/408
Landowner supports the allocation set out in policy H13, but considers policy H13 itself overly prescriptive.	H13.20	Support for the allocation of H13 noted. The Council notes the landowners concerns about prescription within the Draft Local Plan. However, it is important that this site is delivered in a comprehensive manner, and that the requirements for infrastructure, the need for open space and the	None required.	DLP/1992

		mitigation required to ensure separation between Pitsea and Bowers Gifford are achieved. There are a number of landowners in this location, and there is a risk that without a degree of prescription this will not be achieved. The Council does not therefore back away from the approach that it has taken in policy H13 in identifying the open space and infrastructure required to support development in this location.		
Supports provision of landscape buffer between Pitsea and Bowers Gifford.	H13.21	Support noted.	None required	DLP/2553
The landscape corridor must incorporate wildlife enhancements led by a Green Infrastructure masterplan.	H13.22	Noted. Part 3 of policy H13 identifies the requirement for ecology enhancements to be incorporated into the landscape buffer. Part 6 requires a net gain in biodiversity to be achieved, making use of the landscape corridor.	None required.	DLP/2242
Object to alternative proposal to the east of Bowers Gifford due to impact on the Green Belt	H13.23	Objection noted.	None required.	DLP/1064
Consider land to the south of the London Road (to the north of the A13) for development purposes.	H13.24	It is noted that there is already development within this location, and that the road network provides a potential alternative Green Belt boundary. Consideration will however need to be given to the relationship between the proposed location of development on site H13, and this site in order to ensure that it complements development in this	Consider whether site H13 can be extended to incorporate land to the south of the London Road, but to the north of the A13, without undermining the purpose of the landscape buffer. If considered appropriate, amend the allocation in policy H13 accordingly.	DLP/416, Delph/2421, DLP/2435, DLP/2419, DLP/2438

		location and does not undermine the purpose of the landscape buffer.		
Support for the relocation of sports clubs from Gardiners Lane South in this location, although concerned about the phasing of development to enable this	H13.25	Support for the relocation of sport pitches from Gardiners Lane South to this site is noted. Policy H13 requires the preparation of a Masterplan which will identify how sports pitches will be accommodated on this site. This would allow the developers of Gardiners Lane South to identify how best to bring forward replacement sports provision in this location ahead of development occurring if necessary.	None required	DLP/4221, DLP/4215
Need to provide clarity with regard to the relationship between A127/pound Lane junction improvements and development site.	H13.26	It is agreed that increased alignment is required between H13 and the associated highways improvements on the A127. New modelling is being undertaken to determine how this mitigation will work to accommodate the cumulative effects of development at East Basildon and South Wickford. This will be used to inform the requirements of policy H13 in the final Local Plan.	Amend the phased alignment of policy H13 with the provision of the new junction on the A127 at Pound Lane using evidence emerging from the cumulative impact modelling.	DLP/3441, DLP/513DLPQQ/923, DLPQQ/580
Alternative Option 2 is as well located as the preferred option, in relation to Basildon Town Centre.	H13.27	Whilst the land to the north of Burnt Mills Road may be as close to Basildon Town Centre as the preferred allocation site, it is still someway away from Basildon Town Centre, and does not have access to existing community facilities and public transport provision that can be found in the preferred site located further South. Development in this location will result in Bowers Gifford	None required.	DLP/3441DLPQQ/936

		being a dispersed settlement, whilst the preferred option would create a more compact and sustainable community.		
Development of this scale will require around 3fe primary school provision. This could be achieved through the provision of a new 2fe school, plus expansion of an existing school. St. Margarets could potentially accommodate this expansion.	H13.28	Engagement on this site proposal through the Draft Local Plan has highlighted a need for more detail to be provided in relation to the layout and distribution of development and open space on this site. Further work on a high level masterplan for this site will be undertaken. This will incorporate further engagement with service providers such as ECC, and enable a more defined approach to education provision for this site to be determined.	Work with the County Council to determine how the education needs of this site can be met in greater detail. If appropriate amend policy H13 to reflect the outcomes of this work.	DLP/2617, DLP/7392,
Developer promoting land within this strategic allocation supports the allocation.	H13.29	Support noted.	None required.	DLP/124, DLP/2927, DLP/2943, DLP/2071
Developer objects to the requirement for a landscape buffer running through the centre of the site- considers it is not justified or aligned with green infrastructure evidence.	H13.30	The Council's Settlement Hierarchy Review highlights the implications of development in the location of H13 on the separation between Pitsea and Bowers Gifford. Meanwhile the Council's Outline Landscape Appraisal recommends that development does not span the entire area between Pitsea and Bowers Gifford. Finally, the principle of leaving space between these two settlements was given some weight by the Inspector in his considerations of the Little Chalvedon Hall proposal. There is therefore some significant justification for the provision of a strategic landscape corridor running through this site. It is however	Undertake some high level masterplanning work to articulate the open space elements and development elements of site H13 more clearly.	DLP/124, DLP/2943, DLP/133

		agreed that this corridor needs to be better articulated in terms of its requirements and its positioning in the submission local plan, and masterplanning work will be undertaken to assist in this.		
Development site has own access and can go ahead early and without a masterplan.	H13.31	It is noted that access can be achieved to some elements of the land within site H13 without the need for a masterplan. However, it remains the case that a masterplan is required for this site to ensure the efficient and effective use of land and the provision of sufficient infrastructure.	None required.	DLP/124, DLP/2943
Concern about the loss of agricultural land.	H13.32	It is noted that the site proposed in policy H13 currently has some agricultural uses occurring. It is however being promoted for development by landowners, and therefore it is not necessarily the intention of the landowners to continue with his agricultural practice in the future. The NPPF requires the highest level of protection to be given to the <i>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</i> . Agricultural land falls into three grades. Grade 1 being the highest. The agricultural land in Basildon in Grade 3. This means that it is not the best and most versatile agricultural land. The NPPF does not therefore offer protection to the land at site H13 for agricultural purposes.	None required	DLP/2510, DLP/9587, DLPQQ/248, DLPQQ/955
Landscape evidence provided by developers indicates that land at Hall Farm (east of Bowers Gifford) is less	H13.33	The Council will give consideration to the information submitted in relation to Hall Farm. However, it should be noted that other concerns were also raised in relation to development in	Consider whether the information provided in relation to Hall Farm is sufficient to overcome the fundamental concerns regarding development in this alternative	DLP/2219

harmful in landscape terms than other development locations.		this location including impact on the Green Belt, and the dispersal of development giving rise to additional journeys. The SA expresses concerns in this regard, which are not overcome through the presentation of the additional landscape information.	location. If appropriate amend the Local Plan accordingly.	
Eversley School concerned that loss of adjacent open space will affect PE curriculum as no green space within school grounds	H13.34	Concerns of the schools noted, as are the potential impacts on the school curriculum. There is a need for a masterplanned approach to development in the location of site H13, and it is recommended that this requirement of the school is factored into that process to ensure ongoing access for the school to open green space.	In undertaking high level masterplanning work for this site to identify open space areas and development areas, factor in the open space requirements of the Eversley school.	DLP/2516
Landowner seeks reconsideration of land to the north of Burnt Mills Road for housing development purposes.	H13.35	Consideration has been given to housing in this location as part of the preparation of the Draft Local Plan. It was considered that residential development in this location would cause harm to the landscape and Green Belt, and would result in a dispersed development pattern that would result in people having to travel to get their service needs met compared to development further south adjacent to Bowers Gifford. Residential development in this location was not supported for that reason. Reconsideration will be given to this proposal, but it is not clear how this fundamental issue will be overcome.	Reconsider the proposal for land to the North of Burnt Mills Road to determine whether the fundamental issues preventing allocation for residential development can be overcome.	DLP/2521
Concern about the loss of Page Wood to development.	H13.36	Policy H13 requires the retention and conservation of wildlife features such as woodland habitat through cross	Through the preparation of a high level masterplan, identify	DLP/3316

		reference to policy NE4. However, it is recognised that the areas proposed for development and open space could be better articulated through the Local Plan and a high level masterplan of policy area H13 will be prepared.	development and non-development areas in this location.	
A higher quantum of development should not be sought to justify the provision of transport improvements.	H13.37	All funding for transport improvements must be supported by a business case. Such business cases are considered on the basis of the growth that they support, including housing growth. A junction in this location would see land made available in Wickford for housing growth and also in Basildon. Additionally, transport improvements in this location will improve access to the A127 Enterprise Corridor from the East, which is important given that the A130 is playing an increasing role in the strategic highway network from the north. Without growth the Council will not be able to put forward the business case for investment in transport infrastructure, and it will not therefore be delivered. This will be detrimental to both residents, businesses and to economic growth and wellbeing.	None required.	DLP/3311
Objects to site allocation H13 as it does not enhance sustainability of Bowers Gifford and North Benfleet or provide enough housing to support additional infrastructure. Raises	H13.38	Objection to site allocation H13 noted. New sites submitted for consideration during the consultation will be considered by the Council in the next HELAA Review and other evidence base to assess their suitability for potential development.	Review evidence base.	DLP/2212DLPQQ/91

concern with current allocation and recommends alternative sites adjacent to Bowers Gifford and North Benfleet to accommodate growth - Hall Farm and Little Chalvedon Hall.				
H13 does not include upgrades to infrastructure for sustainable transport modes	H13.39	Criteria 4(g) of Policy H13, which relates to the site allocation to the east of Basildon, sets out the requirements for new and improvements to existing public transport and cycling routes as part of the development.	None required.	DLP/3309
Masterplan should guide development in H13.	H13.40	Policy H13 states that a masterplan is required for this site to ensure the efficient and effective use of land and the provision of sufficient infrastructure.	None required	DLP/1988
Consider land to the northeast of H13 for development purposes.	H13.41	Consideration will need to be given to the relationship between the proposed location of development on site H13, and this site in order to ensure that it complements development in this location.	Consider whether site H13 can be extended to incorporate land to the northeast.	DLP/133, DLP/14294DLPQQ/695, DLPQQ/939
Impact of construction traffic and activity on residents.	H13.42	It is recognised that construction traffic can cause amenity issues for those living near development sites for a temporary period of time. It is also recognised that the proposal in this location will bring more construction traffic into an area which has seen development in recent years. Given the concerns raised, it is proposed that an additional requirement is introduced into the policy regarding Pollution	None required.	DLPQQ/124, DLPQQ/356, DLPQQ/266, DLPQQ/268

		and Residential Amenity to enable controls to be put in place in respect of construction traffic movements, mitigation of impacts and remediation of any damage. This would apply to all developments including site H13.		
Development in this location will make it undesirable and/or affect property values.	H13.43	Evidence on the benefits of planning recently published by the RTPI shows that well planned development contributes positively to the desirability of an area, and maintain and enhance property values within an area. There is no evidence to suggest that the reverse will occur in this location. Policies within Chapter 12 of the Draft Local Plan deal with ensuring that new development is of a high quality. Property values are not a valid planning consideration that the Council can take into account when developing its Local Plan.	None required.	DLP/7273, DLP7933, DLPQQ/392, DLPQQ/356, DLPQQ/404, DLPQQ/268, DLPQQ/726
Concerns over the accessibility of the proposed landscape buffer.	H13.44	The required open space provision will be delivered as a landscape buffer, and should be multi-functional in its purpose and accommodate formal and informal open spaces, sports pitches, opportunities for ecology, routes for active travel and areas for surface water flood risk management as stated under criterion 3 of Policy H13.	None required.	DLPQQ/356
More houses should be located to the East of Basildon.	H13.45	Site H13 has been subject to a range of assessments which indicate that a higher level of growth may not be appropriate due to significant landscape and Green Belt impacts.	None required	DLPQQ/325, DLPQQ/939

<p>Suggestions regarding the development design and tenure for the housing allocation.</p>	<p>H13.46</p>	<p>The design and type of dwelling on each housing allocation will be based on the developers proposal when applying for planning permission. The proposal should be subject to other relevant policies within the Local Plan including design policies which ensure that proposals are in keeping with the character of the existing area.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLPQQ/923</p>
<p>Requests further clarification on the proposed landscape buffer between Pitsea and Bowers Gifford.</p>	<p>H13.47</p>	<p>It is noted that there are concerns about the proposed landscape buffer between Pitsea and Bowers Gifford. The Council's Settlement Hierarchy Review highlights the implications of development in the location of H13 on the separation between Pitsea and Bowers Gifford. Meanwhile the Council's Outline Landscape Appraisal recommends that development does not span the entire area between Pitsea and Bowers Gifford. There is therefore some significant justification for the provision of a strategic landscape corridor running through this site. It is however agreed that this corridor needs to be better articulated in terms of its requirements and its positioning in the submission local plan, and masterplanning work will be undertaken to assist in this.</p>	<p>Undertake some high level masterplanning work to articulate the open space elements and development elements of site H13 more clearly.</p>	<p>DLPQQ/522</p>

<p>Would like to be updated on any new businesses coming to Bowers Gifford.</p>	<p>H13.48</p>	<p>Noted. Anyone who has previously responded to a public consultation on the Local Plan/ Core Strategy/ Dunton Garden Suburb and remains on the Council's consultation database as an interested person/organisation, will either get an email or a letter at the different stages of the Local Plan's preparation process, including consultation stages and Examination in Public. At planning application stage neighbouring properties would be notified and site notices would go up nearby to provide details of the proposal at H13.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>DLPQQ/675</p>
---	---------------	--	-----------------------	------------------